HISTORY

OF THE

BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,

WITH AN

EXPLANATION OF ITS OFFICES AND RUBRICS.

BY

REV. C. M. BUTLER, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY AND LITURGICS IN THE DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH, PHILADELPHIA.

NEW YORK:

THOMAS WHITTAKER,

2 AND 3 BIBLE HOUSE.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1900, by
Rev. C. M. BUTLER, D.D.,
in the Office of the Librarian of Congress. All rights reserved.

PREFACE.

THE present work is in no sense a republication or rearrangement of the volume published by the author several years ago, with the title "The Book of Common Prayer Interpreted by its History." In that work the history of the Prayer Book and the examination of its various offices were referred to only so far as they served to prove and illustrate the doctrines of the Church, with a view to apply them to the heart and conscience, and to enforce the duties which result from them. Its primary object was not to give a complete history of the Book, and to explain in detail its Offices and Rubrics. That *is* the object of the present volume. In this "History" and by these "Explanations," the doctrines of the Church are brought out, but are not, as in the former work, made the subject of extended vindication and enforcement.

WEST PHILADELPHIA, March, 1880.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

PREFACE iii

PART I.

HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

CHAPTER I.

FIRST PRAYER BOOK OF EDWARD VI. 1

CHAPTER II.

PREPARATION FOR REVISION; AND THE REVISED PRAYER BOOK OF EDWARD VI., A. D. 1552 14

CHAPTER III.

REVISION OF THE PRAYER BOOK UNDER QUEEN ELIZABETH, 1559 . 27

CHAPTER IV.

THE PRAYER BOOK DURING THE REIGN OF QUEEN ELIZABETH . . 40

CHAPTER V.

THE PRAYER BOOK IN THE REIGN OF JAMES I. 53

CHAPTER VI.

THE PRAYER BOOK FROM 1604 TO 1662 63

CHAPTER VII.

PAGE

VARIOUS ATTEMPTS TO REVISE AND MODIFY AND SUPERSEDE THE ENGLISH LITURGY 73

CHAPTER VIII.

THE PRAYER BOOK OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES 86

CHAPTER IX.

EXTENT AND LIMITATIONS OF RITUAL LAW AND LIBERTY IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND 96

CHAPTER X.

POSITION OF THE COMMUNION TABLE; THE POSITION OF THE CELEBRANT; AND THE VESTMENTS TO BE WORN 108

CHAPTER XI.

LITURGICAL LAW AND LIBERTY IN THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES 123

PART II.

EXPLANATIONS OF THE OFFICES AND RUBRICS OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY 139

CHAPTER II.

MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER 148

CHAPTER III.

PAGE
The Litany 191

CHAPTER IV.

The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion 194

CHAPTER V.

Baptism of Infants and Adults, and Private Baptism . . 234

CHAPTER VI.

The Catechism, Confirmation, and Matrimony 246

CHAPTER VII.

The Order for the Visitation and Communion of the Sick . . 261

CHAPTER VIII.

The Order for the Burial of the Dead 267

CHAPTER IX.

The Churching of Women; Prayers to be Used at Sea, for the Visitation of Prisoners, for Thanksgiving, and for Families; the Articles; and the Ordinal 277

CHAPTER X.

Consecration of a Church or Chapel, and Institution of Ministers into Parishes or Churches 283

INDEX 291

PART I.

HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

CHAPTER I.

FIRST PRAYER BOOK OF EDWARD VI.

I PROPOSE to give a brief history of the Book of Common Prayer, which shall indicate and explain the successive changes which it has undergone from its first issue under Edward VI., 1549, and notice some of the proceedings which preceded and led to its formation.

I.—FIRST BOOK OF HOMILIES.

In July, 1547, immediately after the accession of Edward VI., the Book of Homilies was published to supply the deficiency of teachers, and "to teach the people that salvation was wholly purchased by the death of Christ" (Stephen's Book of Common Prayer, Introduction, p. 29). This had been designed by King Henry VIII., and the Convocation in 1542 (Strype's Memorials of Cranmer, p. 211). The design was opposed by Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester. His first argument was *quieta non movere*. His chief objection, however, was to Cranmer's "Homily of Salvation," because it excluded charity and works from all efficacy in the work of justifying (Strype's Cranmer, p. 213). In recent times this

book has been claimed by Dr. Newman to include, or virtually to sanction still, many doctrines of the Church of Rome (Newman's Apologia, pp. 166–7).

Says Strype (Memorials, Vol. 2, p. 49), "A great many of the clergy as well as of the laity could not digest these homilies. And, therefore, sometimes when they were read in Church, if the parishioners liked them not, there would be such talking and babbling in the Church, that nothing could be heard. And if the parish were better affected, and the priest was not so, then would he so hawk and chop it (I use the words of old Latimer) that it was as good for them to be without it, for any word that could be understood."

The First Book of Homilies cannot fairly be adduced as a present standard of doctrine in our Church, or even in the Church of England. In our Church "the order for the reading of said homilies in the Churches is suspended until revision of them can conveniently be made for the clearing of them as well from obsolete words and phrases as from local references." No such revision has been made. Moreover, the changes in the First Book of Edward which were made and introduced into the Second Book, omit and *expel* some of the doctrines which were found alike in the Homilies and in the first draught of the Liturgy.

II.—ROYAL VISITATION.

In September, 1547, a Royal Visitation through England and Wales was appointed. The ordinary powers of the Bishops were suspended. The kingdom was divided into six districts, to each of which a commission was assigned. The Commission consisted of three or four laymen and one able preacher. They took with them the Book of Homilies and copies of the Articles to be inquired of at the visitation. The Articles refer to, and attempt to reform some of, the grosser

abuses of the Papacy. (Stephen's Pr. Bk. Intro. pp. 31–34. Strype's Eccl. Mem., Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 75–83.)

The questions asked at the Visitation were such as these: "Do the clergy renounce the Pope's authority? preach in the vulgar tongue? encourage superstitious pilgrimages, and images? Recite the creed in the English? Read the Epistle, Gospel, and Lessons in English? Visit the sick? Give the Holy Days to God?"

Bishop Gardiner was violently opposed to these visitations and inquiries. He was the object of frequent lampoons because of his attachment to the old superstition. One of them, entitled "A poore help, buckler and defence of Holy Mother Kirke," has this passage:—

> "Will none in this land
> Step forth to take in hand
> These fellows to withstand?"

And again:—

> "Christ cannot all day be kept in a box,
> Nor yet set in the stocks,
> Nor hidden like a fox,
> Nor be a prisoner under locks."

III.—THE ORDER OF THE COMMUNION.

In 1548, a most important step was taken to reform the public worship. A Communion service, by the direction of an Act of Parliament, was composed, which provided that the Holy Communion should be received by the laity in two kinds, and should exclude the superstitions of the Mass. This service is an intermediate step between the old and the new office. All of it, except that part which relates to the communicants, which is in English, is still in Latin. The people were allowed to use or abstain from auricular confessions previous to communicating, and were warned against

entertaining uncharitable opinions of those who differed from them in this particular. (Stephen's Pr. Bk., Intro., pp. 37–39.)

The Act also directed that "the priest should give a godly exhortation wherein shall be expressed the benefit and comfort promised to them who worthily receive the Holy Sacrament." Maskell (Ancient Liturgies, &c., p. xlii.) says: "It is not to be supposed or hoped that many priests paid attention to an order merely of the King and Parliament, and interpolated an extemporary exhortation into the authorized and Catholic use to which they had been accustomed." This criticism, whether or not just, shows at least that, in the judgment of Maskell, the office was not of permanent obligation and authority; and that, therefore, it cannot properly be appealed to, as it sometimes is, in support of a higher view of the Sacrament than appears in the later revisions of the Liturgy.

This office was issued and enjoined to be used, by a proclamation of the King. A letter was sent with it from the Privy Council to each of the Bishops. This letter asserts that it has been prepared by the most grave and well-learned Prelates; and it is commanded to be used. The principal object of the office was to introduce the use of the wine with the bread in the Communion, and it was prepared with a special view to benefit the laity. The priest still retained his Missal for the service that pertained to himself. The elevation of the elements was forbidden. It seems remarkable that this custom, which was earliest forbidden, should be the first to be re-introduced by those who in our day have desired a more elaborate service in the administration of the Lord's Supper.

The Mass had been previously abolished by Statute 1 Ed. VI., Chap. 1, 1547. This Act provided for the administration of the Communion in two kinds, and for the participation of the clergy with the people.

IV.—CRANMER'S CATECHISM.

In 1548 Cranmer put forth his Catechism, a translation of a Latin work by Justin Jonas, a Lutheran divine, which was itself a translation of a German Catechism. Cranmer generally follows the Latin translation closely; but in some instances he introduces new matter. The author of the Catechism undoubtedly held and taught the doctrine of consubstantiation. Cranmer is supposed to have held the same doctrine when he made the translation. But although there is no doubt that he *once* held that doctrine, yet the difference between the language of his translation and that of the Latin and German book, and his own subsequent explanations, prove that he did not hold it *at that time*. The Latin Catechism speaks of the body and blood of Christ as being present *in the Sacrament;* whereas, that of Cranmer describes them as *being received*. (Stephen's Pr. Bk., Intro., pp. 40–41; Cranmer's Catechism, by Burton, 17, 18, 19; Strype's Cranmer, p. 227.)

In the controversy of Cranmer with Gardiner on the subject of the Lord's Supper (1550) he speaks of "the charge of the latter against himself, which he had given in a book called The Catechism, in his own name set forth." To this charge Cranmer thus replies: "And in the Catechism by me translated and set forth, I used like manner of speech, saying that with our bodily mouths we receive the body and blood of Christ. Which my saying divers ignorant persons (not used to read old ancient authors, nor acquainted with their phrases and manner of speech) did carp and reprehend for lack of good understanding; and in that Catechism I teach not, as you do, that the body and blood of Christ is contained in the Sacrament *being reserved;* but that *in the administration thereof* we receive the body and blood of Christ; whereunto, if it will please you to add or understand the word

spiritually, then is the doctrine of my Catechism sound and good, in all men's ears that know the true doctrine of the Sacrament."

In Cranmer's reply, subsequently to Dr. Smith, he wrote: "He (Gardiner) understood not my book of the Catechism, and, therefore, reporteth untruly of me, that I in that book set forth the real presence of Christ's body in the Sacrament. Unto which *false report* I have answered in my fourth book, chapter viii. But this I confess of myself, that *not long before* the said Catechism I was many years past in that error of the real presence, as I was in divers other errors, as of Transubstantiation, and of the sacrifice propitiatory of the priests in the Mass, &c. &c. But after it pleased God to show unto me, by His Holy Word, a more perfect knowledge of His Son Jesus Christ, from time to time, as I grew in knowledge of Him, little by little, I put away my former ignorance."

Lathbury (History of the Book of Common Prayer) says: "At this time Cranmer held the Lutheran notion of the Lord's Supper. Nor did he ever relinquish his opinion of a real presence." But Cranmer here expressly declares that *at this time* he did not hold the Lutheran doctrine. A doctrine of the real presence he indeed always held; but he expressly disavowed belief in the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the elements of bread and wine.

Much has been said of the influence of Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer, in giving an ultra-Protestant—a Continental Protestant—character to the Book of Common Prayer. Strype, on the contrary, shows that there is good reason to believe that Cranmer brought Peter Martyr to his own more moderate views. "And I am apt to think," says Strype, a mere annalist singularly free from all party bias, "that a careful perusal of these authorities, collected by the Archbishop, and his conversations with this learned Prelate, was the cause of bringing Peter Martyr to the true doctrines, for

at his first coming to Oxon he was a Papist or a Lutheran as to the belief of the presence. And as Feckenham, Dean of St. Paul's, told Bartlett Green, at his examination, Bucer's views were from the beginning like those of Cranmer." These foreign divines were sent for *because* they were known to be of the same general opinion as the English Reformers.

Two other points in that Catechism are peculiar. It is declared that, "if we shall have heathen parents and die without baptism, we shall be damned everlastingly." It is also asserted that there are three Sacraments: The Lord's Supper, Baptism, and Absolution.

V.—THE WHOLE SERVICE IN ENGLISH—A. D. 1549.

In May, 1548, the same divines, who drew up the order for the Communion, were authorized to prepare a formulary for public worship in English. This collection of services was approved in Convocation and confirmed by the Parliament and King; and came into use in May, 1549. This Liturgy, though the same in substance as that now in use, differed from it in several important particulars. In the Burial Service prayers for the dead are retained. It also contains a direction for anointing those who are baptized, with oil, and for the anointing of the sick, and retains a form of exorcism. The use of the cross in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and in the offices of Matrimony, Confirmation, and Visiting the Sick, is also retained. (Short's History of the Church of England, § 743, note b.)

From rubrics in this first Book, which were afterwards omitted, it appears that greater liberty in the use of the service was then allowed than at any subsequent period. "If there be a sermon, or for other great cause, the curate, by his discretion, may leave out the Litany, the Gloria in Ex-

celsis, the Creed, the Homily, and the exhortation to the Communion."

"As touching kneeling, crossing, holding up the hands, knocking upon the breast, and other gestures, they may be used or left as every man's devotion serveth without blame."

VI.—SOURCES OF THE FIRST BOOK OF 1549.

This book was largely drawn from the old English USES, particularly from that of Sarum. Says Dr. Cardwell: "In the great body of the work, indeed, they (the Commission of divines) derived their materials from the early services of their own Church; but in the occasional offices it is clear that they were indebted to the labors of Melancthon and Bucer, and through them to the older Liturgy of Nuremberg, which those Reformers were instructed to follow." (Two Liturgies of Edward VI. compared.) All that was considered superstitious and Romish in these ancient offices was omitted, and only that which was believed to be Scriptural and primitive retained. Much use was also made of the Reformed Breviary of Cardinal Quignonius, first published in 1536. This Breviary was sanctioned by the then reigning Pontiff, and used extensively for about forty years in the Romish Church. The preface to the first Book of 1549 is taken almost wholly from it.

The enemies of the Liturgy, Papal and Puritan, made a great outcry at the statement of the compilers, "that they had come to an uniform agreement by the aid of the Holy Ghost." They argued that the claim was absurd and profane, in view of the fact that the Liturgy was again changed three years later. But it is plain that the statement involves no claim to inspiration, but is simply a pious and appropriate acknowledgment, that, by the aid of Him, from whom all holy desires, all good counsels, and all just works proceed, and who

maketh men to be of one mind in a house, they had been able to bring their difficult labors, notwithstanding the diversities of opinion which were inevitable at such a time, to an harmonious conclusion.

The Litany was the same as that of Sarum, except that one hundred and thirteen addresses to Apostles, Saints, and the Blessed Virgin were omitted. It differs from the Primer of Henry only in three petitions, and from the present English Litany only in the petition to be delivered from the detestable tyranny of the Bishop of Rome.

The Baptismal Office was drawn largely from the *Simplex et Pia Deliberatio* of Bucer and Melancthon, which was drawn up at the request of Hermann, the Reforming Archbishop of Cologne, and published at Bonn, in 1545, and in English by Day, in 1547–48. This had for its basis the earlier form of Nuremberg.

In addition to the ceremonies and gestures, such as "kneeling, crossing," &c., which, as we have seen, were declared to be lawful and indifferent, there was a prescription for a white chrisom for children who were to be baptized, and water for baptism was to be consecrated once a month, and the child was to be dipped in the water thrice.

The object of Cardinal Quignonius was to introduce larger portions of the Scriptures into the Breviary, and to reduce the inordinate number of versicles and single verses which were used in the Romish offices. His plan was sanctioned by Clement VII., but his Breviary was superseded by a bull of Pius V., in 1570, which authorized the Franciscan form which had been previously in use.

VII.—THE ORDINAL.

In the latter part of the year 1549, a meeting of Divines (probably the same that had been engaged in compiling the

Prayer Book) took place for framing an Ordination service. It was published in March of the same year, and, after some alterations, adopted in the Prayer Book of 1552. It corresponds very nearly with that now in use.

VIII.—PROHIBITION OF THE USE OF ANY OTHER SERVICE.

The preface to this first Book of Edward, after setting forth its superiority to those hitherto in use in the Church of England, enjoins its exclusive use in the public services of the Church. It is claimed to be more in harmony "with the mind of the old fathers, and more profitable and commodious than that which of late was used." It omits many unprofitable things, some of which were untrue, some uncertain, some superstitious. It concludes with these words:—*

"And, whereas, heretofore there hath been great diversity in saying and singing in Churches within this realm, some following Salisbury use, some Herford use, some the use of Bangor, some of York, and some of Lincoln; *now from henceforth all the whole realm shall have but one use.* And if any would judge this way more painful, because that all things must be read upon the book, whereas, before by reason of so often repetition they could say many things by heart; if those men will weigh their labor with the profit in knowledge which daily they shall obtain by reading upon the book, they will not refuse the pain, in consideration of the great profit that shall ensue thereof."

IX.—THE OLD SERVICE BOOKS TO BE DESTROYED.

It is significant of the earnest purpose of the framers of this service and of the Protestant majority in Parliament to

* I do not feel it necessary to retain the spelling of these early documents, which is by no means uniform.

do away utterly with the old Papal offices, and to render it impossible that they should be surreptitiously used, that they were ordered by Parliament to be destroyed. These books were very numerous, expensive, and beautiful, composed of parchment and not unfrequently illuminated and valuable as specimens of art. It was ordered (3d and 4th of Ed. VI., chap. 10th), that—"since the Common Prayer had been set forth containing nothing but the pure Word of God—corrupt, untrue, vain, and superstitious services should be disused." From the enumeration of these corrupt services which follows, it is plain that *no other* than the Liturgy thus set forth could be lawfully used. Moreover, it had been expressly enacted that "all ministers be bounden to say and use the matins, even-song, celebration of the Lord's Supper, commonly called the Mass, and administration of each of the Sacraments, and of all their common and open prayer, in such order and form as is mentioned in the same book, and *none otherwise* (Statutes 2 and 3 of Ed. VI., chap. 1. Stephen's Introduction, p. 56).

The enumeration in the Act first mentioned is as follows: "That therefore all Antiphones, Missals, Grayles, Processionals, Manuals, Legends, Pies, Portueses, Primers, in Latin or English, Couchers, Journals, Ordinals, or other books or writings, should from henceforth be abolished and extinguished; and that all persons and bodies corporate, having any such books or images taken out of Churches or Chapels, are, under penalty of fine or imprisonment, to destroy such images, and within three months to deliver such books to the Bishop of the Diocese or his Commissary to be destroyed."

After the fall of the Duke of Somerset, a rumor prevailed that the old service books were to be restored. To prove the contrary, the Archbishop ordered that all the books above enumerated should be called in, and directed that those who were thus authorized to demand them "should take the same

books and so deface them, that they may never after serve to any such use, or be at any time a let to that godly and uniform order." (Lathbury's Hist. of the Pr. Bk., p. 31.)

X.—THE ORDER OF THE SERVICE, AND SOME OF ITS SPECIAL FEATURES.

The Morning Prayer is called "An order for Mattyns daily through the year," and commences with the Lord's Prayer, and ends with the collects for the day, for peace and for grace. The order for Even-Song is similar to that for Matins, but differs from it in having a larger number of versicles after the Creed, and in a change in the phraseology of the collect for peace. The Collects, Epistles, and Gospels are preceded by *introits*, consisting of portions of the Psalms to be sung, before the Communion Service, as the ministering priest entered and prepared for its celebration.

The rubric concerning vestments which has been the subject of much controversy, and much litigation in ecclesiastical courts in our day, is the third one which is prefixed to the communion office, and is in these words, "Upon the day and at the time appointed for the ministration of the Holy Communion, the priest that shall execute the holy ministry shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration, that is to say, a white alb plain, with a vestment or cope. And where there be many priests or deacons, there so many shall be ready to help the priest in the ministration as shall be requisite, and shall have upon them likewise the vestures appointed for the ministry, that is to say, albs with tunicles."

In the last leaf of the book there are "Certain notes for the more plain explication and decent ministration of things contained in this book." They provide for the habits that are to be worn at all public ministrations, except at that of the Communion. In parish Churches the services are to be

performed by the priest in a surplice. In Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, dignitaries, being graduates, shall wear the hoods which pertain to their several degrees in the service, and when they preach. Whenever the Bishop shall officiate at the Communion or in any public ministration, he was directed to wear, "besides his rochette, a surplice, or alb, and a cope or vestment, and also his pastoral staff in his hands, or else borne and holden by his Chaplain."

The explanation of ceremonies, "why some be abolished and some retained," is an exceedingly judicious exposition. The principles which should regulate the use of ceremonies are laid down with great precision; and, although different minds may form different judgments as to whether these principles have been successfully exemplified in this First Book, few will be found to deny that they are just and wise.

The key to the whole of the exposition is found in the following sentence: "And besides this, Christ's Gospel is not a criminal law (as much of Moses's law was), but it is a religion to serve God, not in bondage of the figure or shadow, but in the freedom of the spirit, being content with only those ceremonies which do serve to a decent order and godly discipline, and such as be apt to stir up the dull mind of man to the remembrance of his duty to God, by some notable and special signification, whereby he might be edified."

CHAPTER II.

PREPARATION FOR REVISION; AND THE REVISED PRAYER BOOK OF EDWARD VI., A. D. 1552.

I.—PROHIBITION OF SUPERSTITIOUS PRACTICES.

In certain Articles, issued by Royal authority just after the First Book of Edward VI. was put forth, we find the priest prohibited from the use of the following ceremonies in the celebration of The Lord's Supper: "Kissing the Lord's Table, washing his fingers, blessing his eyes with the paten, shifting the book from one place to another, laying down and licking the chalice, holding up his fingers, hands, and thumbs, showing the Sacrament openly before the distribution of the Communion, ringing or sacrying bells, setting any lights upon the Lord's board at any time; and finally he is required to use no other ceremonies than are appointed in the King's Book of Common Prayer, or kneeling otherwise than is in the said book." (Cardwell's Documentary Annals, 1, 63, 64.)

Besides these orders given by Royal authority, Bishop Ridley also issued injunctions for visitations, and to the end of them added this direction: "And finally that the minister in the time of the Holy Communion do use only the ceremonies and gestures appointed by the Book of Common Prayer, and *none other*, so that there do not appear any counterfeiting of the Popish Mass." (Cardwell, Doc. Ann., 1, 81–2.)

II.—CONTROVERSY ABOUT ECCLESIASTICAL HABITS.

When Hooper was appointed to the See of Gloucester, he refused to be consecrated in Episcopal habits—the chimere,

rochet, and cope, and other habits which were still retained. Cranmer and Ridley argued against his scruples, and Bucer and Martyr earnestly counselled conformity. But Hooper stood out for eight months, and was confined to his house and silenced, and yielded at length with the reservation that he should not be compelled to wear the usual Episcopal habits except upon public occasions, when he was assisting at or performing some sacred function. His greatest objection was to the scarlet chimere; but his feeling in reference to the habits was evidently the same as that which was so strongly evinced subsequently by the Puritans. "The fact that he consented to wear the habits on occasions of public service—when above all their use as superstitious was most to be avoided, if avoided at all—does not give us so high an idea of his character and his enlightenment of conscience as we should wish to find in one who subsequently became a noble martyr for the truth." The incident is memorable and mournful as the first exhibition of that over-scrupulous spirit of dissent which afterwards ripened into the Puritan separation. (Butler's Eccl. History, 2, 428.)

"It is but due to the memory of Hooper to state that he did not object to all vestments, but to those then in use—which have since been rendered less showy—because they were conspicuous and rich, and associated with the idolatrous service of the Mass. 'In his discussion with Peter Martyr, Hooper had objected,' in the third place, that the particularity and richness of their religious equipage would be apt to draw the eyes of the congregation, to break their attention, and to turn to an amusement; whereas, *if the habit were plain and unornamented*, nothing of this kind would happen." (Collier, V. p. 380.)

This conduct of Hooper has been sometimes vaguely ascribed to foreign Protestant influence. But this event occurred previous to the Protestant exodus to the Continent,

and all the foreign divines in England, with the exception of the radical Alasco, and many on the Continent united in urging Hooper to conform. Both they and Ridley and Cranmer counselled conformity, not because of strong personal preference for the habits, but on the ground of conformity to law in matters unessential. The case is well stated in Dr. Ridley's Life of Bishop Ridley (p. 321): "The question was not about the expediency of enjoining these or any particular habits, but whether, having been enjoined, they could be worn without sin, or without sin refused." And this was in fact the subject discussed between Bishop Ridley and Hooper. One cannot avoid seeing that the good Bishop regarded Hooper as somewhat pragmatical and impracticable, from a letter on the subject to be found in Bradford's Remains (Parker Society Ed., p. 390): "Let him revoke his errors and agree and subscribe to the doctrine, and not condemn that for sin which God never forbade, ungodly adding to God's word; and I shall not, for any necessity that I put on these vestments, let to lay my hands upon him, and admit him Bishop, although he come, as he useth to ride, in a merchant's cloak, *having the king's dispensation for the act*, and my Lord Archbishop'a commission *orderly* to do the thing."

III.—DIRECTIONS FOR THE REMOVAL OF STONE ALTARS.

Ridley, Bishop of London, ordered the altars in his diocese to be taken down, and tables to be set up in their room in some convenient place of the choir or chancel. The king's council enforced these injunctions through the high sheriff. The language of Ridley was as follows: "And whereas some use the Lord's board after the form of a table, and some of an altar, therefore, wishing a Godly unity to be in all the diocese, and considering that the form of a table might more

move the hearts of the simple from the old superstitious opinion of the Popish Mass, and to the right use of the Lord's Supper, the curates and Church wardens are exhorted to erect and set up the Lord's board *after the fashion of an honest table*, decently covered, in such place of the choir or chancel as shall be thought most meet by their discretion, so that the minister might, with the communicants, have their place separated from the rest of the people; and to take down and abolish all other by-places or altars." (Strype, Eccl. Mem., Vol. 2, part 1, 355, 400–1.)

IV.—KING EDWARD'S DESIRE FOR FURTHER CHANGES IN THE PRAYER BOOK.

Sir John Cheke, who had been a teacher of King Edward, asserted "that, if the Bishops and Divines would not change what ought to be changed, the king would do it himself, and when they came to a parliament the king would interpose with his own authority." (Strype, Memorials of Cranmer, Vol. 1, p. 301.)

There is no doubt that this gifted boy-king, gentle and pious as he was, had very decided and advanced Protestant opinions, and that he was very peremptory, in obedience to his conscience, in carrying them into effect. His singular maturity appears from his diary, and from a discourse about the reformation of many abuses, secular and religious. That this incomplete discourse was the result of the king's own thought, and that it was composed by himself, Burnet makes no doubt. "In which," he writes, "as there is a great discovery of a marvellous probity of mind, so there are strange hints to come from one not yet fourteen years of age; and yet it is all written in his own hand, and in such a manner that any one who shall look upon the original will clearly see that it was his own work; the style is simple and suit-

able to a child; few men can make such composures, but somewhat above a child will appear in their style, which makes me conclude that it was all a device of his own." In that discourse the king writes: "As for the prayer and divine service, it were meet the faults *were drawn out* (as it was appointed) by learned men; and so the book to be established and all men willed to come thereto to hear the service." (Burnet, Reformation, Record No. 2.) Beyond doubt the king's personal influence and will were among the chief causes of the revision of the Liturgy.

V.—THE CONVOCATION OF CANTERBURY.

The subject of a revision and amendment of the First Book was debated in the Convocation of Canterbury in 1550. Two points received special attention in the Upper House. (1) The Holy Days which are retained in the calendar. (2) The form of words used in the distribution of the elements. The questions raised were whether the number of Holy Days might not be diminished; and whether the words used in the distribution of the elements, because of the liability to be misunderstood, should not be changed. The Lower House did not at once express its opinions upon the subject; but, although the records of the Convocation were destroyed in the great fire of 1666, we have yet satisfactory proof that an agreement between the two Houses was effected. Peter Martyr writes to this effect at the beginning of 1550 (Collier, V. p. 434). He gives thanks to God for making himself and Bucer instrumental of putting the Bishops in mind of the exceptionable places in the Common Prayer; and he adds, "that Archbishop Cranmer told him that he had met about this business and *had concluded on a great many alterations.*" (Joyce, English Synod, p. 486–7.)

VI.—DRIFT OF OPINION BETWEEN THE FIRST AND SECOND BOOK OF EDWARD VI.

From the facts enumerated above, it is evident that the general drift of opinion among those who were most influential in the Church was towards further reformation. The same thing appears also from the increased fraternal relation to, and recognition of, the foreign Protestant Churches by the King, by Archbishop Cranmer, and other Bishops and Divines during this period. Three learned men from the Continental Churches, Fagius, Peter Martyr, and Martin Bucer, were appointed Professors in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. A Church of French and German refugees under John Alasco was established, under the sanction of the government at London. Cranmer opened a correspondence with Melancthon and Calvin with a view to the union of all Protestant Churches in one confession of faith. Hence it is not in accordance with the facts of history to represent the review of the first Prayer Book as brought about by the pressure and direct influence of foreign Reformers in England and on the Continent. No doubt the intercourse of the English Bishops and Divines with the continental Churches had exercised great influence upon their opinions, but it was not from the direct representations and persuasions of the latter that the design to modify the first Liturgy arose. It was an unprompted, spontaneous movement of the English Church, the result in part of doctrinal development, in part of the pronounced desire and purpose of the king, and in part also of external circumstances which were favorable for further reformation.

It is the more necessary to bring out this fact distinctly, because it is the habit of those who wish that the reformation of the service had stopped at the First Book, and indeed had not gone even so far, to refer the changes then made to

the influence of the foreign Reformers. Lathbury, in his History of the Prayer Book (p. 33), writes thus: "Cranmer and his brethren consented in consequence of the *solicitation* of some foreign Reformers, not because the suggested changes were important in their estimation, but for the sake of peace." This is certainly an erroneous statement. No one who reads the correspondence of the Reformers (Parker Library) can doubt that Cranmer and his brethren considered the changes agreed upon to have been important. Nor is the statement that the changes were made at the solicitation of the foreign Reformers better founded. The Rev. G. Ridley, in his life of his ancestor, Bishop Ridley, presents the matter in its true light in the following words: "A review of it therefore was determined, and many things were thought proper to be altered. Bucer and Martyr were desired to give their *opinions* also, as appears by a letter of Martyr to Bucer, January 10, 1551, in which we see that these foreigners in general agreed in censuring the same things. But they had no other hand in the alterations than in delivering their censures separately to the Archbishop. For in the same letter, Martyr says that what the points were that it had been agreed had been altered, *he knew not, and dost not presume to ask.*" . . . "And as the reviewers were not moved by them, but by some members of the Convocation, so many alterations were agreed *before those Professors were consulted*, as appears from the same letter." (Laurence's Bampton Lectures, p. 247.)

Peter Martyr, it was seen, so far from exercising a controlling influence over the mind of Cranmer, was brought by him to adopt a different view of the Eucharist from that which he had hitherto held. In a treatise (1550) on the Eucharist, addressed to Cranmer, Martyr assumes altogether the position of one who submits his opinions to the Archbishop, rather than of one who presses them upon him. (Laurence, *idem.*)

VII.—THE SUGGESTIONS OF MARTYR AND BUCER.

The question of a revision of the Prayer Book began to be agitated in 1550. Says Burnet: "Several things have been continued in it, either to draw in some of the Bishops, who by such yielding might be prevailed to concur in it; or in compliance with the people, who were fond of their old superstitions. Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr were *consulted* upon the subject, and the book was translated into Latin for their examination. They highly commended its general character, but made some objections to particular features. Some of the objections were such as were made by others also, and were removed at the revision." (Burnet's Ref., pp. 404–5.)

It may be added that other suggestions made by them were not carried out, and that many changes were made which they did not suggest.

"Bucer advised that in Cathedrals the choir might not be too far separated from the congregation, since in some places the people could not hear them read the prayers. He wished there were a strict discipline to exclude scandalous livers from the Sacrament. He wished that the old habits might be laid aside, since some used them superstitiously, and others contended much about them. He did not like the half-office of Communion, or second service, to be said at the altar, when there was no Sacrament. He was offended with the requiring people to receive once a year, and would have them pressed to it much more frequently. He disliked that the priests generally read prayers with no devotion, and with such a voice that the people understood not what they said. He would have the Sacrament delivered into the hands, and not put into the mouths of people. He censured praying for the dead, of which no mention is made in the Scripture, nor by Justin Martyr an age after. He thought that the prayer,

that the elements *might be unto us* the body and blood of Christ, favored Transubstantiation too much; a small variation might bring it nearer to the Scripture form. He complained that Baptism was generally in houses, which being the receiving of infants into the Church ought to be done more publicly. The hallowing of the water, the chrism and the white garment, he censured as being too scenical; he excepted to the exorcising of the devil, and would have it turned to a prayer to God—that authoritative way of saying, 'I adjure thee!' not being so decent. He thought godfathers answering in the child's name, not so well as to answer in their own. He would not have confirmation given on a bare recital of the Catechism, but would have it delayed until persons did really desire to renew their baptismal vows. He would have catechizing every Holy Day, and not every sixth Sunday; and that people should be still catechized after they were confirmed, to preserve them from ignorance. He would have all marriages to be made in the full congregation. He would have unction for the sick and praying for the dead to be quite laid aside; as also the offering of chrisoms at Churching of women. He desired that Communion should be celebrated four times a year." (Burnet's Ref., 404–5.)

VIII.—SECOND PRAYER BOOK OF EDWARD VI., 1552.

The revised Prayer Book was prepared by Cranmer and Ridley and other divines, and received authority from the Parliament and King. The chief variations from the first book were as follows (Joyce, Synods, p. 477):—

1. The first book contained or *enjoined* what the second book did *not* in the following points: (1) Introits or Psalms, or portions of Psalms, prefixed to the collects for the day. (2) A second Communion for Christmas and Easter, and a feast for Mary Magdalene. (3) The use of the terms *Mass*

and *altar*. (4) The mixture of wine and water in the Eucharist. (5) A rubric for placing the elements on the altar, and the form of delivering them—"This is my body which is given for you." (6) Invocation, oblation, and signing the cross in consecration. (7) Prayers for the dead in the Communion and Burial service. (8) A rubric for receiving the bread in the mouth, and another for reserving the Sacrament. (9) Communion at burials. (10) Anointing in Visitation and Communion of the sick. (11) A form of exorcism, trine immersion, and chrism in Baptism. (12) A second service for the consecration of water for Baptism. (13) The signing of the cross in Matrimony and the Visitation of the sick. (14) The "ornaments" rubric, which provides for the use of the rochet, alb, and vestment or cope, and tunicle.

2. The second book enjoined what the first did not, in the following particulars: (1) A rubric requiring all priests and deacons to say Morning and Evening Prayer daily, publicly or privately. (2) The Sentences, Exhortation, Confession, Absolution, Jubilate Deo, Cantate Domino, Deus Misereatur, in Morning and Evening Prayer. (3) The Commandments, and a third exhortation in the Communion service. (4) The declaration to the effect that kneeling at the Sacrament does not imply worship of the elements. (5) The ordinal with slight variations. (6) The Athanasian Creed appointed for saints days, as well as for the great festivals.

"The rapid progress of change during the short reign of Edward, and the earnest endeavor that was made to include all degrees of Reformers within the pale of the Church, may be easily traced in the alterations introduced in the year 1552. The encouragement which had been in the mean time given to private judgment, and the necessity that was followed and readily obeyed of yielding to the sole authority of Scripture, had swept away the foundation of Romanism, and brought into the minds of men principles and motives power-

ful enough to throw down the strongholds of their earlier associations." (Cardwell, p. 4.)

IX.—IMPORTANCE OF THE CHANGES MADE IN THE SECOND BOOK.

The most important and significant of the changes made in the Second Book were the three following:—

1. The omission of the rubric which provided that the alb and vestment or cope and tunicle should be used by the priest in the administration of the communion, and the substitution for this rubric of one by which the use of these vestments was forbidden. This new rubric was as follows: "The minister at the time of the communion, and at all other times of his administration, shall use neither alb, vestment, or cope; but being an Archbishop or Bishop he shall have and wear a rochet, and being a priest or deacon *shall have and wear a surplice only.*"

2. The change of the form of words in the distribution of the elements. In the first Book the rubric is as follows: "The *priest* shall first receive the communion in both kinds, and, when he delivereth *the Sacrament of the body of Christ*, he shall say, 'The *body of our Lord* Jesus Christ, preserve thy body and soul to everlasting life.' In the second Book this rubric is omitted, and the following carefully discriminated change in the phraseology by which it was introduced is made. *The minister* shall first receive the communion in both kinds, and when he delivereth *the bread* he shall say, 'Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.'"

3. The declaration concerning kneeling at the celebration of the Sacrament was ordered to be added as a rubric by the council. It was not, however, prepared until many of the copies of the second Book were printed; and in those copies in which it was not printed it was placed on a separate leaf.

It was and still remains, in the English Book, an elaborate and emphatic protest against "the corporeal presence of Christ's body and blood, and against what is known in our day as Eucharistic adoration"—adoration of Christ in or with the elements. "Whereas it is ordained in this office for the administration of the Lord's Supper that the communicants should receive the same kneeling (which order is well meant for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ, given to all worthy receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the Holy Communion as might otherwise ensue); yet, lest the same kneeling by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved; it is hereby declared that thereby no adoration is intended or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or to any corporeal presence of Christ's natural body and blood. For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored (for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians); and the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven and not here, it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one."

X.—SENTIMENTS OF THE PARLIAMENT AND PEOPLE.

The changes introduced into the Second Book have often been represented as if they were due to the ultra-Protestant views of the King, and a small group of like-minded Bishops and divines and counsellors, *against* the wishes and opinions of the Parliament and the great majority of the people. It can scarcely be doubted, indeed, that a large majority of the rural and laboring classes were still devoted in their hearts to the old superstitions. But there is good reason to believe

that the Parliament and the more educated classes were, with full convictions, on the side of the Reformation. The Bishop of Ely, in his preface to "The Book of Common Prayer Interleaved," remarks that "it appears that the reform of the services had now somewhat exceeded the desires of the people; for the Act of Parliament, which authorized the new book, declared that the doubts which had been raised in the use and exercise of the First Book proceeded rather from the curiosity of the ministers and mistakers than from any worthy cause." The language of the Bishop conveys the idea that *the reform* of the services, *i. e.*, the doctrinal changes made in it, were regarded by the Parliament and people as arising from the curiosity of the clergy and the mistakers rather than from any worthy cause; whereas, that language is applied "to the use and exercise" of the First Book. It is in short a declaration that there is no such real difficulty in the use of the Book, in the order and succession of the different parts of the services, as the curiosity of the ministers and mistakers of its proper use suppose. This meaning is clear enough from the brief sentence quoted by the Bishop. But we find it still more clear when we turn to the Act itself, which is inserted in the Interleaved Book, for which the Bishop wrote the preface. There it is declared that, although there have arisen, without "worthy cause," "doubts for the *fashion and manner* of the ministration of the same; yet as well for the more plain and manifest explanation hereof, as for the *more perfection* of the said order of common service in some places where it is necessary, it has been decided to make the same prayers and fashion of the service more earnest and fit to stir Christian people to the true honoring of Almighty God." They, therefore, set forth this new Book to be "accepted, received, used, and *esteemed*," now that it is "explained and *made fully perfect*." The Act, fairly interpreted, certainly does not lead to the conclusion that it went beyond the convictions of the Parliament or "exceeded the desires of the people."

CHAPTER III.

REVISION OF THE PRAYER BOOK UNDER QUEEN ELIZABETH, 1559.

I.—POSITION AND OPINIONS OF THE REFORMERS DURING THE REIGN OF QUEEN MARY.

A FEW of the Reformed Divines remained in England during the reign of Queen Mary. Most of them, however, repaired to the Continent, and formed small communities and Churches in various cities. The exiles are believed to have amounted to about eight hundred. Among them were almost all those who previously or subsequently were eminent in the English Church. This association of the Reformers with the Protestant Churches and divines of the Continent increased their anti-papal tendencies and feelings. The rise of Puritanism in the Church is usually and justly referred to the influence of those who came under and yielded to the system, doctrine, and discipline which prevailed in Geneva and Zurich; though the example of Bishop Hooper renders it quite probable that it might have arisen from the midst of the English Church without any impulse from abroad.

II.—TROUBLES AT FRANKFORT.

The congregation of exiles at Frankfort was greatly disturbed by discord and hot discussions concerning the Liturgy and the ceremonies. The Genevan party in the Church was headed by John Knox, and the Episcopal party by Dr. Cox, afterwards Bishop of Ely. (Strype's Grindal, p. 15. Annals, Vol. ii. part 1, p. 482.) Unseemly collisions occurred in the time of divine service, and questions of doctrinal and Ritual

and disciplinary casuistry were discussed with an earnestness and minuteness which remind one of similar discussions in Butler's Hudibras. An effort was made, which was for a time successful, to set aside portions of the English Liturgy; but upon representations which were made by the English party to the government of the Netherlands, then under the Regency of the Duchess Margaret, of the book that Knox had published under the title of "The Monstrous Regiment of Women," Knox was banished, and the party of Cox acquired ascendency. The incident is memorable because it gave rise to those questions and discussions which were subsequently renewed in England. (Troubles in Frankfort, 1554. Reprinted in England, 1846.)

III.—FEELINGS AND VIEWS OF THE REFORMERS ON THE ACCESSION OF QUEEN ELIZABETH.

The persecutions suffered by Protestants under Queen Mary's reign, and the intercourse with foreign Churches, had deepened the feelings of the Reformers against the Church of Rome, and had drawn them into closer relations with the Protestants of the Continent. The evidence of this state of mind on the part of those divines who subsequently became Bishops and leaders in the reorganization of the Church, is abundant in the letters of the Reformers published by the Parker Society. They did not feel, as some of the Reformers did in the reign of Edward, that it was either duty or true policy so to constitute the Church, as to bring into it, without a radical change of opinion, the members of the Church of Rome. There can be no doubt, indeed, that, if the re-establishment of the Church had been left to the clergy uninfluenced by the Queen, the habits and most of the ceremonies would have been abolished; and that everything which resembled or served to recall the Popish cere-

monies would have been removed. Says Strype, "And first the Bishops who were but newly returned out of their exiles, as Cox, Grindal, Horne, Sandys, Jewel, Parkhurst, Bentham, upon their first returns, before they entered upon their ministry, labored all they could against receiving into the Church the Papistical habits, and that all the ceremonies should be clean laid aside. But they could not obtain it from the Queen and Parliament. And the habits were enacted. Then they consulted together what to do, being in some doubt whether to enter into their functions. But they concluded unanimously not to desert their ministry for some rites, which they considered were but few, and not evil in themselves, especially since the doctrine of the Gospel remained pure and entire. And in this counsel which they had taken they continued well satisfied." (Strype's Ann. of Ref., Vol. 1, pp. 263–64.)

It is natural to suppose that such would be the feelings of the Reformers in reference to the policy of attempting to conciliate Romanists, by adapting the services and ceremonies of the Church to their views. They had abundant evidence of the fact that the Romanists would be content with nothing less than the acceptance of their whole system. The Council of Trent was at that time in session, and everything there showed a determination to fasten legally upon the Church the abuses which had been hitherto only tolerated. Cardwell, speaking of some decided Puritans, adds in reference to the more conservative class that, if the clergy could have had full sway, the Reformation would have been carried further than it was. "The exiles in general were prepared to adopt a tone of moderation and even to comply with some observances which they positively disliked, in the hope that they might be able at no distant period to remove the remaining errors." (Cardwell, Conference, p. 15.)

Yet, notwithstanding the truth of these statements, it is a curious fact, mentioned by Sir Edward Coke, that Romanists, for the most part, conformed in the early part of Queen Elizabeth's reign. He writes: "As well as those restrained as generally all the Papists in the kingdom, not any of them did refuse to come to our Church, and yield their formal obedience to the laws established. And this they all continued, not any one refusing to come to our Churches during the first ten years of Her Majesty's government. And in the beginning of the eleventh year of her reign, Cornwallis, Beddingfield, and Sybyard were the first recusants; they absolutely refusing to come to our Churches. And until they in that sort began, the name of recusant was never heard among us." He adds that "The Pope Pius V., before the time of his excommunication of Queen Elizabeth, sent his letter unto Her Majesty, in which he did allow the Bible and the book of Divine service, as it is now used among us, to be authentic and not repugnant to the truth, but that therein was contained enough necessary to salvation, though there was not in it so much as conveniently there might be; and that he would allow it unto us without changing any parts, so as Her Majesty would acknowledge to receive it from the Pope, and by his allowance; which Her Majesty denying to do, she was presently by the same Pope excommunicated. And this is truth concerning Pope Pius Quintus as I have faith to God and man. I have often heard avowed by the late Queen her own words, and I have conferred with some lords who were of the greatest reckoning in the State, who had seen and read the letter which the Pope sent to that effect, as has by me been specified. And this upon my credit as I am an honest man is most true."

IV.—POSITION OF QUEEN ELIZABETH.

It is clear that Queen Elizabeth, although she had rejected Romanism, did not sympathize fully with the Reformers to whom she was compelled to commit the re-establishment of the Church. Her position is accurately stated by Miss Aiken (Memoirs of Queen Elizabeth, p. 251): "Probably had she found herself free to follow the dictates of her own inclination she would have established, in the Church of which she found herself the head, a kind of middle scheme like that devised by her father." In evidence of this state of mind we have her persistent use of the crucifix and lights in her own chapel, against her own injunctions and the remonstrances of her most favored Bishops; her reluctance to have images removed; her bitter prejudice against the marriage of the clergy; her avowal of belief in the real presence, and her occasional worship of the Virgin Mary. (Strype's Ann., vol. i. pt. 1, p. 2; Idem, i. 237, 259–62; Life of Parker, vol. i. p. 90–2, 191–3.)

Says Strype: "And, indeed, what to think of the Queen at this time as to her religion, one might hesitate somewhat, who, in her sister's reign, went to Mass and complied outwardly with her practice; and as John Knox told her in a letter, dated at Edinburgh, though, indeed (as he added), it was for fear of her life, that she declined from religion and bowed to idolatry. And Sir Richard Shelley, called Prior of St. John's at Jerusalem, but living beyond the sea under this Queen, in a private letter to her, speaking of what he had lost for his diversity of conscience in religion, disagreeable to the law established—Whereunto he saith: 'Your Majesty's self at the first *was not easily brought to condescend.*' She protested also to Count Feria (whom King Philip had lately sent into England) that she 'acknowledged a real presence in the Sacrament, which he signified to Philip in a letter

dated in November, the day before Queen Mary died. The same also she protested to the Lord Lamac; and also that she did now and then pray to the Holy Virgin.'"

V.—QUEEN ELIZABETH'S FIRST PROCEEDINGS.

The Queen proceeded at first with great caution. The circumstances in which she was placed made such a course necessary. In order to avoid the tumults which might arise from sudden changes, she issued proclamations forbidding that any alterations should be made in the public services, and that there should be any public preaching. For six weeks after her accession, no changes were announced by the authority of the Queen. She herself attended Mass, and ordered no other change in its administration than that the Host should not be elevated. The Lower House of the Parliament was prepared to respond to the well-known wishes of the Queen for reformation of the services, and the rejection of the Romish priests and the Papal doctrine: but the Bishops, in the House of Lords, and the Convocation, earnestly resisted any return to the Protestant faith and formula. "A protest was drawn up by the two Houses against any religious change, and avowing their firm adherence to Romish doctrine. The natural body and blood of Christ they maintained were really present in the Sacrament by virtue of the Word duly spoken by the priest. Peter and his successors were Christ's vicars and supreme rulers in the Church, and authority in all matters of faith and discipline belonged, and ought to belong, only to the pastors of the Church and not to laymen." (Geikie's Hist. of the English Ref., p. 489.)

VI.—COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO REVISE THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

A committee of divines was appointed by the Queen to revise the Book of Common Prayer. This committee was, at first, necessarily private. No other course was prudent, or even, at that time, practicable. All the Sees were in the hands of Popish Bishops, and from them nothing but a summary rejection of the Prayer Book could be expected. The committee consisted of eight members, four of whom (Cox, Whitehead, Grindal, and Pilkington) had been exiles, and three who had remained in England (Parker, May, and Bill), and one civilian, the learned Sir Thomas Smith. The latter four members of the committee were more nearly in harmony with the views of the Queen, and more devoted to her person, and, therefore, less disposed to any changes which were unacceptable to her, than those who had resided on the Continent. The first question which arose was: Which of the two books of Edward should be adopted? Guest, afterwards Bishop of Rochester, who was supposed to sympathize more with the views and feelings of the Queen than any of the members of the committee, was called in by Cecil, at the request of the Queen, to assist at their deliberations. He had received instructions from Cecil to secure the adoption of the First Book of Edward. The statement has been made that Guest was placed at the head of the commission (Geikie), and if this were so, of which I find no evidence, it only proves the more strongly the inability of the Queen to carry her point with the committee. For Guest appears either not to have made, or not to have succeeded if he did make, the attempt. After the divines had completed their work, some changes were made in the Book before it received the sanction of the Parliament. "It is probable," says Cardwell (p. 21), "from the known sentiments and the subsequent conduct of

the Queen, that they were inserted previously by herself or her Council."

It seems probable that Guest did not make an attempt to introduce the first Book of Edward, or that if he made the suggestion, by the direction of the Queen, through Cecil, to the committee, it must have been with no expectation or desire that it would be adopted. For, in his letter to Cecil himself on this subject, he uses language which expresses his conviction of the inexpediency of change except under urgent circumstances. In that letter he writes thus: "Ceremonies once taken away as ill used should not be taken again, though they be not evil of themselves and might be well used. And this for four causes." . . . He also opposes the setting up of crosses in the Churches, although he must have known that the Queen retained a crucifix in her chapel. He also declares that the surplice is a suitable habit in which to perform all services—a declaration specially significant from the fact that the Queen desired the adoption of the First Book more for the purpose of restoring the "ornaments" rubric than for any other reason. "Because it is sufficient to use the surplice in baptizing, reading, preaching, and praying, therefore it is enough also for the celebration of the Communion. For if we should use another garment therein, it should seem to teach that higher and better things be given by it than be given by the other service; *which we must not believe.*" He objects to prayers for the dead, and to the prayer of consecration in the communion service. He contends for the placing of the bread in the hands of the recipients, and he would have standing or kneeling at the option of the communicants.

These facts seem to prove that Elizabeth could not find any divines of standing to urge conformity to her peculiar views. Those whom she selected, and the one upon whom she most

relied for that purpose, did not share her opinions, and could not be persuaded to urge conformity to her wishes.

It is certain that the committee as a whole disapproved of any difference in the use of vestments in the performance of the Communion office from that which was adopted in all other parts of the divine service.

VII.—THE INJUNCTIONS OF 1559.

Previous to the Publication and enforcement of the revised Book of Common Prayer, injunctions similar to those issued by King Edward on his accession, were put forth by the Queen. Among the provisions were the following. It was enjoined that no deacon or priest should marry without a license of his Bishop and two justices of the peace. All were to kneel at the prayers and show a reverence when the name of Jesus was pronounced. No altar should be taken down without the consent of the Curate and the Church Wardens. The sacramental bread was to be round and plain, without any figure upon it, but somewhat thicker and broader than the cakes prepared for the Mass.

VIII.—THE SECOND BOOK OF EDWARD VI. ESTABLISHED BY THE ACT OF UNIFORMITY, APRIL 28, 1559.

The Act (1 Eliz. 2) enacted that the Second Book of Edward VI. should again be brought into use on the 24th of June. It is a singular fact that the Act states that the Book is established with *one* alteration or addition of certain lessons to be used on every Sunday, and the form of the Litany altered and connected, and the two sentences only added in the delivery of the Sacraments to the communicants, and *none other or otherwise*. But it is found that several other and somewhat important alterations, and one that has proved the

source of great dissension, were made. It is, perhaps, impossible to ascertain with certainty whether the language of the Act was the result of mere inadvertence, or whether it was introduced with the design of deceiving Parliament, and leading it to adopt the Act with more changes introduced into the Second Book than it might have been willing to sanction. Joyce says that the learned person who drew the Act "led the legislature into a snare" (Joyce, Synods, 541, note 9). "It is most probable," says Proctor, "from the known sentiments and subsequent conduct of the Queen, that these changes were ordered by herself and her Council (Cardwell, Conferences, p. 21), and that the Book was then laid before Parliament." (Proctor, p. 55; Lathbury's Hist. of Com. Pr. Bk., p. 44–6.)

IX.—VARIATIONS FROM THE SECOND BOOK OF EDWARD.

1. The Queen's Book directed that the Morning and Evening Prayer should be used in the accustomed place of the Church, whereas, Edward's Book had directed that it should be used in such place, and the minister should so turn him as that the people best may hear.

2. The Second Book directed that ministers at the Communion and all other times should wear neither the alb, vestment, nor cope; Bishops and Archbishops to wear a rochet, and priests and deacons to wear a surplice only; whereas, the Queen's Book restored the Rubric of the First Book of Edward, which prescribed the alb, vestment or cope, and tunicle. This was the most important of all the changes that were made, and we shall see that its introduction was peremptorily insisted upon by the Queen, to the great grief of the Bishops, and that it was carried into effect probably nowhere but in the Queen's private chapel.

3. The petition in the Litany against the Bishop of Rome, for deliverance from his "detestable enormities," was omitted.

4. The prayer for the Queen was slightly altered.

5. Some unimportant changes in a few prayers and collects were made.

6. In the Communion Office the two different forms of words of the First and Second Books, in delivering the bread and wine to the communicants, were united.

7. The declaration was *omitted* which declared that no adoration of the elements was intended by kneeling at the reception of the Sacrament. In reference to this declaration, it is to be remembered that it was not a Rubric authorized by Parliament and the King, but that it was inserted by order of the Council alone, when a portion of the edition of the Second Book had been already printed. Moreover, we find that, though the declaration itself was omitted, the doctrine which it announced was diligently proclaimed—perhaps all the more diligently because of the omission—by the Bishops and divines. Bishops Grindal and Horne, writing to Bullinger and Gaulter, in 1567, assure them that the omitted declaration "continued to be most diligently declared, published, and impressed upon the people." (Zurich Letters, 1st series, p. 277.)

X.—INFERENCES AND REMARKS.

It plainly appears from this history that it was not the desire or policy of the divines who were most influential in the establishment of the Church, to modify the Second Book of Edward VI. with a view to conciliate and embrace the Romanists.

In proof of this is the following statement in "Bully's Variations of the Communion and Baptismal Offices" (p. xiv.). "The Revisers of the Articles in 1562 were *less scrupulous* in their censure of Romish errors than the original compos-

ers of them in King Edward's reign. For now, to use the language of Dr. Laurence, the sacrifice of the Mass, which was denominated by their predecessors simply *figmenta*, they characterized as *blasphema figmenta*, not hesitating to call that which was universally esteemed the most sacred, and which certainly was the most lucrative doctrine of the Romish Church, *blasphemous*.

Another fact to be noticed is that the prohibition against controversies was omitted. "It being thought very fitting," says Strype, "that the errors of the Popish religion should be treated of and confuted for the vindication of the Reformation." (Strype's Parker, Vol. I. p. 316.)

It appears also that it was only the personal preference and the determined will of the Queen which prevented further changes in the services and ceremonies of the Church, which would have brought them into nearer resemblance to those of the Continental Churches. It is well known that the new Bishops, with scarcely an exception, were opposed to the use of any vestments in the public services. Bishop Pilkington in a letter to Gaulter says, "I confess that we suffer many things against our hearts groaning under them. We cannot take them away, though we are ever so much set on it. *We are under authority, and cannot innovate anything without the Queen.*" (Burnet, p. 838.)

Bishop Sandys (Cardwell, Conferences, p. 36) writes: "The last Book of the service is gone through with a proviso to retain the ornaments which were in use in the first and second year of Edward VI., until it please the Queen to take further order for them. Our gloss upon this text is that we *shall not be forced to use them*, but that others in the mean time shall not convey them away; *but that they may remain for the Queen.*" This language leads to the conclusion that the renewed rubric was not intended to be compulsory on the clergy, but was introduced in order to satisfy the Queen, and

to legalize the usages of the Royal Chapel. (Strype's Annals, chap. 4.)

From the facts above stated it is seen that the divines who revised the services were no less decidedly Protestant and Anti-Romish than those who set forth the amended Liturgy of Edward VI. The changes and restorations which were effected, which seemed to favor the less thoroughly reformed First Book of Edward, were forced upon the Church by the peremptory will of Elizabeth, against the convictions of her leading divines. The statement, therefore, which is often and vaguely made, that the Church, under Elizabeth, returned to the doctrinal and ritual position occupied by, and expressed in the First Book of Edward, has no foundation in fact. That a new and higher tone, ritual, ecclesiastical, and sacramental, was then impressed upon the Church, which it has since retained, has been the contention of both those who count it to be to her honor, and those who regard it as her misfortune or her shame. But in view of the facts above presented, and of the further fact that all the portions of the Second Liturgy which were drawn from the Continental and Protestant Churches were retained in Elizabeth's Book, this position cannot be sustained. The three changes which seemed to be a return to the higher from the lower Ritual and doctrinal position of the reign of Edward were—the restoration of the "ornaments" rubric, the renewal of the two clauses in the distribution of the elements, and the omission of the declaration of the significance of kneeling at the Sacrament. And these changes are often claimed to have permanently rescued the Prayer Book from an ultra-Protestant position. But the new Rubric, as we have seen, was introduced at the insistance of the Queen, and for her use, and was nowhere carried into effect except in her chapel; the restoration of the first clause of the First Book of Edward, in the distribution of the elements, was rendered impossible to be misunderstood by

retaining in connection with it the form used in the Second Book, and the declaration with regard to kneeling was restored in the final review of the Prayer Book under Charles II. As Churchmen we have reason to be thankful to Elizabeth that she restrained her divines from such sweeping changes as would have deprived the Church of some of her seemly ceremonies, which they were anxious to discard; but as Protestants we have equal reason to be thankful that they did not allow the Queen to impose upon the Church her individual preference for a high doctrine of the Eucharist and a gorgeous ceremonial.

CHAPTER IV.

THE PRAYER BOOK DURING THE REIGN OF QUEEN ELIZABETH.

I.—THE LATIN PRAYER BOOK.

A Latin Prayer Book for the use of the universities and the great public schools was set forth in 1560. The letters patent by which it was put forth recommend its use to the clergy generally in their private daily devotions. The Book was complained of by several of the Reformers as having altered the meaning of some expressions. For example—in the Latin Book, in the Communion Office the Church is said to have given *suam potestatem* of absolving penitents (Clay's Elizabethan Liturgies, p. 28). Strype, under the year 1568, states that most of the colleges in Cambridge would not tolerate it as being "the Pope's Dreggs," and that even some of Bennet College went contemptuously from the Latin Prayers, the Master being the Minister that then read the same. (Proctor, Com. Pr., pp. 65–75.) In the preface to the

Ordinal this expression occurs—"Non sit ad hoc nisi *divinitus vocatus*." There is also a reservation of the consecrated elements (Liturgical Services of Queen Elizabeth, preface, p. xxvii.). A multitude of Saints' Days also are in the Calendar which are not in the First Book of Edward. Many of these, however, were subsequently inserted in the New Calendar of 1662.

II.—OCCASIONAL SERVICES AND PRAYERS.

Three forms for private use came forth under the Queen's authority in 1559—an English Primer in 1560 and an *Orarium*—and in 1564 the *Preces Privatæ*. In 1560 a short form for seasonable weather, and the good success of the affairs of the realm, was published. During this reign more than forty forms of prayer and service, most of them public, were put forth on the authority of the Queen. Among them were "Sundry Godly Prayers," to be used for "sundry purposes." They are first found in the end of the Quarto Prayer Book, 1552. They were also printed in the earlier Elizabethan Prayer Books.

Many of these prayers are most admirable; and it is to be doubted whether the Church has not lost much, and failed in full duty to the spiritual interests of her children, by the omission of these prayers from her Liturgy. If our Churches were open at certain hours of the day when there is no public service, and persons were permitted to step in for a brief period, and offer up, in the quiet house of God, such petitions as their sins, or sorrows, or necessities prompted, we cannot doubt that, availing themselves of the aid of these fervent prayers, multitudes would be comforted, and strengthened, and quickened to renewed consecration. Especially does this remark apply to those poorer classes, who in their narrow homes, burdened with cares and toil, can so seldom find time

or place to offer up the prayers of which their hearts are full, but which they cannot shape into full expression. The Church of Rome teaches us a good lesson in this respect. One of the most touching sights to be seen in her Churches abroad is that of poor men and women depositing their bundles and baskets near the door, and kneeling down, with or without their manuals, for brief devotions in the sacred and silent house of God, with which there are only holy associations, and where there is nothing to mar or interrupt their devotions. It is questionable whether the present excessive multiplication of services *for* the people (though with them) will tend so much to edification, as would a diminished number with an opportunity for prayers *by* the people, with such aids as these or other "Godly prayers" would furnish, to give expression to their individual supplications, and praises, and intercessions.

III.—AUTHORITY OF THE QUEEN'S INJUNCTIONS.

Not only were the above forms and services put forth, most of them on the sole authority of the Queen; but her authority to modify, and change, and add to the public forms of worship is expressly recognized by Parliament in the Act of Uniformity. The only limitation to this authority is that it shall be "by the *advice* of Commissioners appointed under the great seal of England *or* of the Metropolitan." This is the language of the Act: "Provided always, and be it enacted, that such ornaments of the Church and ministers thereof shall be retained and be in use as was in this Church of England by authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI., *until* other order shall be therein taken by the authority of the Queen's Majesty, by advice of her Commissioner appointed and authorized under the great seal of England for causes Ecclesiastical, or the

Metropolitan of this realm. And, also, if there shall happen to be any contempt, or irreverence in the ceremonies or rites of the Church by the misusing of orders appointed in this Book, the Queen's Majesty may, by like advice of the said Commissioners or Metropolitan, ordain or publish such further ceremonies or rites as may be most for the advancing of God's glory, the edifying of His Church, and the due reverence of Christ's holy mysteries and Sacraments."

"Besides the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, the Queen's Injunctions were supposed to possess the authority of law. These were put forth in 1559, and new impressions of them were published as late as 1600. Whatever, therefore, was their force in the first year of the Queen's reign, it remained the same at the end of it, because new editions were constantly put forth by the Royal authority. This point is not always remembered, and some persons appear to imagine that the Injunctions were intended to serve only a temporary purpose, and that their authority ceased with the publication of the Book of Common Prayer. Such an opinion, however, can be entertained only by those who are ignorant of the fact which I have now stated. The Queen possessed the same authority at the end as at the beginning of her reign, and she claimed the same. Several things were regulated by Injunctions which were not specified by rubrics." (Lathbury, p. 71.)

IV.—THE NEW CALENDAR—1561.

A new Calendar was published in 1561 by a Commission authorized by the Queen, consisting of four persons, of whom the Archbishop of Canterbury was one. They made many changes in the lessons, and reintroduced the names of many saints to the number of nearly fifty, which had been excluded from the Second Book of Edward.

V.—ATTEMPTS TO REFORM THE LITURGY IN THE CONVOCATION OF 1562.

A memorable attempt to diminish the ceremonial of the Church was made in the Convocation of 1562, and failed in the Lower House by a majority of one. If it had been carried there, it is highly probable that it would have been sanctioned in the Upper House—it being doubtful whether there was more than one Bishop who did not prefer that the vestments should have been abolished. Neal, indeed, declares that there was not one; but there is no proof that Parker wished them to be removed. A memorial was presented by thirty-three members of the Lower House, containing seven articles, afterwards reduced to six, which specified the changes then desired by them. They were those which were lost by a single vote, and are as follows:—

1. That all Sundays and principal feasts of Christ be kept holy days, and all others abrogated.

2. That in all parish Churches the minister, in Common Prayer, turn his face to the people, and read so distinctly that all may hear and be edified.

3. That the sign of the cross in baptism be omitted.

4. That kneeling at the Sacrament be left at the discretion of the Ordinary, inasmuch as some are too infirm to kneel, and others superstitiously kneel and knock.

5. That no other vestment in the communion and the service shall be used except the surplice.

6. That organs be removed.

Says Cardwell:—

"In the former list (*i. e.*, the minority) were all those members who had been brought into friendly contact with the practice of foreign Churches in the reign of Mary, including several who, as Lever and Samson, afterwards became Non-conformists; in the latter were the friends of the Arch-

bishops and of Bishops Horne and Cox, together with the Reformers who had remained in England during the reign of Mary, and several who had at the same period relapsed into Romanism."

VI.—THE SECOND BOOK OF HOMILIES.

This second book of homilies was published in 1563. The history of its composition is involved in much obscurity. Burnet attributes a large part of it to Jewel (Preface to the 39 Articles, p. 3). The homilies of faith, salvation, and good works are, with good reason, attributed to Cranmer. The work was begun during the reign of Edward, and revised and finished by Parker and other Divines, as Parker himself testifies.

VII.—ADVERTISEMENTS OF 1565.

These were drawn up by Parker, after a sharp letter of the Queen to him on the increasing neglect to enforce Ecclesiastical laws and regulations. They consisted of five Articles. The fourth was "concerning the outward apparel of persons Ecclesiastical." It was in reference to this matter that there was most objection and resistance. The Article contemplated and regulated both the ordinary habit of the clergy and their habit when engaged in the services of the Church.

1. *Their Ordinary Apparel.*—It was enjoined that all dignitaries in Cathedral Churches, Doctors, Bachelors of Divinity and Law, having Ecclesiastical livings, should wear in their common apparel a broad side-gown, with sleeves, strait at the hands, without any cuffs or falling copes, and tippets of sarsanet, and a square cap, but no hats, except in their journeying. The inferior clergy are to wear long gowns and caps of the same fashion, except in case of poverty, when they may wear short gowns.

2. *Vestments in Church Ministrations.*—In the ministration of Communion in Cathedrals and Collegiate Churches, the principal minister shall wear a cope with Gospeller and Epistoller agreeably; but at all other prayers to be said at the Communion Table, they shall wear no copes, but surplices only; Deans and Prebendaries shall wear a surplice and a silk hood in the choir, and, when they preach, a hood.

"Every minister [*i. e.*, except in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches] saying the public prayers, or administering the sacraments, &c., shall wear a surplice with sleeves; and the parish shall provide a decent table, standing on a frame, for the Communion Table; and the Ten Commandments shall be set on the east wall, over the said table."

From these Advertisements, drawn up by the direction of the Queen, it appears that the Rubric for the use of ornaments, of ministers in the second year of Edward VI., viz., the Albs, Vestments, Copes, and Tunicles (which direction had never been put in practice), was virtually repealed. That Rubric was to remain in force *until* other order should be taken therein by the Queen's Majesty. Other order *was* taken, and provision was made that only surplices should be used by ministers in parish Churches, and that dignitaries in Cathedral and collegiate Churches should wear a cope *only* at the Communion service; and a surplice upon all other occasions. And yet, notwithstanding this, its virtual repeal, the rubric still retains its place in the English Prayer Book, and its present authority has been sometimes asserted, although it has been repeatedly denied by the recent decisions of the highest Ecclesiastical courts.

An important fact is mentioned by Parker in a letter to Cecil, viz., that the Queen had assured him that but for the proviso in the Act of Uniformity, authorizing her to make alterations in rites and ceremonies, she would not have agreed to divers orders in the Book of Common Prayer; and that

by virtue of this law she published further order, in her Injunctions, both for the Communion bread and for placing of tables within the choir. (Parker's Correspondence, p. 375.) The Archbishop continued: "I tell them they do evil to make odious comparisons between statute and injunction; *and yet I say that the injunction hath authority by proviso of the statute.*" In 1571 further reformation of the Prayer Book being demanded by a member of the House of Commons, Cecil replied, "that if the matters complained of were heretical, they were to be condemned; but if they were matters of ceremony, then it behooved us to refer the same to her Majesty, who had authority, as chief of the Church, to deal therein; and for us to meddle with matters of her prerogative it were not expedient."

These facts are extremely important in their bearing upon the question of the legal force of the Advertisements of 1565. They furnish a proof of the fact that the Queen regarded herself as having full power by the provision of the Act of Uniformity to introduce new ceremonies, and therefore to remove others, by the advice of her Commissioners or the Archbishops, and that this authority was not only recognized by the Bishops, but also by her chief secretary, Cecil. The language of the Act is unequivocal and unmistakable: "And also, that if there shall happen any contempt or irreverence to be used in the ceremonies or rites of the Church, by the misusing of the orders appointed in this book, the Queen's Majesty may, by the like advice of the said commissioners or metropolitan, *ordain and publish such further ceremonies or rites* as may be most for the advancing of God's glory, the edifying of His Church, and the due reverence of Christ's holy mysteries and sacraments."

VIII.—THE LEGAL FORCE OF THE ADVERTISEMENTS.

That the Advertisements above described were of *legal obligation*, and were so considered when they were issued and subsequently, and consequently that the Rubric concerning ornaments was legally repealed, although it was not removed from the Prayer Book, appears from the following considerations.

1. They were issued by the Queen's *directions*.

2. They were issued *in the Queen's name*. (Strype, Parker, 3, 84.)

3. Hence they were equivalent to the Queen's Injunctions, *which, by the proviso in the statute of uniformity*, were declared to be of binding force.

4. The Queen did not affix to them her seal, because she was advised "by great persons at court" that it was not necessary,—the authority of the Metropolitan or the Commission, *acting specifically under her order*, being sufficient. (Strype's Annals, 1, pp. 2–131.)

5. They were soon after *called* "ordinances" and "rules," because the term Advertisements was claimed by some not to imply a binding legal obligation; and in March, 1566, they *were finally fully authorized by Royal proclamation.* (Strype, Parker, 1, 318, 427.)

6. They were referred to by Archbishop Parker in his Articles of Enquiry in 1569 (Cardwell's Doc. Ann., 1, 320–1) as follows: "Whether the Holy Sacrament be likewise administered reverently in such manner as by the *law* of this realm, and by the Queen's majesty's *Injunctions*, and by the *Advertisements* set forth by public authority, is appointed and prescribed."

7. In *Archbishop Whitgift's* "Articles touching preaching," &c., in 1584, it is ordered (Art. IV.) that all preachers and others in ecclesiastical orders do at all times wear and use

such kind of apparel as is prescribed to them in the Book of *Advertisements*, and her Majesty's Injunctions, anno primo (Cardwell's Doc. Ann., 1, 413). Here the Injunctions and the Advertisements are placed upon an equal footing of authority.

8. *The Canons of* 1571 contain the following directions: "No Dean, nor Archdeacon, nor residentarie, nor master, nor warden, nor head of any College or Cathedral Church, nor President, nor Rector, nor any of that order, by what name soever they be called, shall hereafter wear the gray amice, or any other garment which has been defiled with the like superstitions. But every one of them shall wear *only* that linen garment which is yet retained by the Queen's commandment."

9. *The Canons of* 1604. Canon 24: "Copes to be worn in Cathedral Churches by those that administer the Communion." "In all Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, the Holy Communion shall be administered upon the principal feast-days, sometimes by the Bishop, if he be present, and sometimes by the Dean, and sometimes by a Canon or Prebendary, the principal minister using a cope, and being assisted by the Gospeller and Epistler agreeably, according to the *Advertisement published*, anno 7th Elizabeth."

10. We have seen how unwilling the Bishops were to reintroduce the rubric of the 2d of Edward, which provided for the use of the alb, vestment, and cope in the administration of the Communion; how Elizabeth found that she could not induce the Bishops, nor even that one Bishop Guest, on whom she relied for this purpose, to recommend the restoration of the First Book of Edward; how Guest himself declared that in all services alike the surplice was a suitable and sufficient garment; and how the Queen, on her own authority, to the grief of the Bishops, ordered the retention

of the "ornaments" rubric in the Liturgy, the Second Book of Edward, which they adopted. We shall now see what, during the reign of Elizabeth, was regarded as the effect of the Advertisements, and how anxious the Bishops were to keep out of the public service of parish Churches the use of any other garment than the surplice.

Archbishop Grindal issues inquiries at Canterbury to ascertain whether "the minister do wear any cope in a parish Church or Chapel," evidently regarding such a custom as a violation of law that was to be reproved and discontinued. (Remains, 159.) Whitgift also speaks of the surplice as required at Communion as well as at other times (Strype, Whitg. App., p. 50). Piers, Archbishop of York, inquires "whether all copes, vestments, albs, and tunicles, . . and like reliques of Popish superstition and idolatry, be utterly defaced and destroyed." "From these extracts it will appear that after the publication of the Advertisements the use of copes in parish Churches was regarded not only as no duty, but by some prelates, at least, as an offence against authority." (How shall we Conform to the Liturgy? J. Craigie Robertson, pp. 97–8.)

11. How strong the current of feeling in the Church ran, during this reign, against the use of any other garment in the celebration of the Communion than the surplice, appears from the fact that copes fell into disuse even in Cathedrals, where they were ordered to be worn. "Thus at Canterbury, in 1573, they had still remaining a great many old copes, which were to be disposed of as the Archbishop thought best. The Dean was charged with having made way with the copes of the Church, which he confessed, because it had been agreed by the Chapter that all the copes should be made away, and that he had two of them, and had £15 for the same." (Strype, Parker, 444.) The copes at King's College,

Cambridge, also, were sold before 1756. (Strype's Ann., 2, 421.)*

12. Later Rubrical authorities, with scarcely any exceptions, until very recent times, refer to the Advertisements of 1566 as the law which has abolished the use of the "ornaments" rubric of the First Book of Edward. The following high authorities are to this effect:—

Bp. Sparrow, Rationale, &c., 6th ed., 1722, pp. 248–9.

* Sir James Stephen, in his argument for the appellant in the Folkstone Ritual Case, argues that the vestments were in use and obligatory in the first years of Queen Elizabeth's reign, and that the object and effect of the Advertisements was to allow, in the case of those who desired it, the use of the surplice only. In answer to the facts adduced above, and especially to the wholesale removal and destruction of vestments, including Copes, in the Diocese of Lincoln, he endeavors to show, and, I think, succeeds in showing, that this could not have been in consequence of the issue of the Advertisements, because this destruction continued all along from 1552 to 1566. But if these vestments were obligatory from 1559, how is it to be accounted for that, against the law for their use, and *by the direction of the Bishop of the Diocese*, the inventories of these vestments, with a view to their removal, continued to be made? The fact of their removal previous to, as well as after, the issue of the Advertisements, proves that it was a settled and well-understood obligation previous to the issue of the Advertisements, and even to the Queen's Injunctions of 1559, to destroy all the old service books (see Chap. I., § IX.), and all the old vestments and paraphernalia of the Unreformed Church. That this removal and destruction included copes, which were legal in Cathedrals, only proves how strong the current of opinion, against any other vestment than the surplice, then ran.

The enumeration of the articles removed from the Churches, in the single Diocese of Lincoln, suggests the enormous number that must have been removed and destroyed throughout the kingdom. There were destroyed 37 censers, 34 cruets, 19 *copes*, 65 vestments, 69 albs, 2 tunicles, 60 crosses, 38 candlesticks, 19 fanons, 24 amices, 26 stoles, 16 corporases, 8 linen cloths, 4 towels, and 2 pillows. (Folkstone Ritual Case, pp. 92 and 316.)

Dr. Bennet's Paraphrase of the Pr. Bk., 2d ed., 1709, p. 5.
Archdeacon Sharp on Rubrics and Canons, pp. 80–1.

13. But the most full and complete *catena* of proofs that the Advertisements had the force of law, is contained in the decree of the Judicial Committee in "the Folkstone Ritual Case" (London *Mail*, May 14, 1877). The proof of the subsequent reception and enforcement, *as law*, of the order established by the Book of Advertisements as to the vestures of the ministers of the Church in the administration of the Holy Communion throughout the Church of England, from 1566 to the Great Rebellion; and again, between the Restoration and St. Bartholomew's day, in 1662, *is complete*. After 1566, vestments, albs, and tunicles (copes, also, in parish and non-Collegiate Churches) are mentioned in the official acts of the Bishops and others, performed in the public exercise of their legal jurisdiction, *only as things associated with* superstition, and to be defaced and destroyed. They were so treated by a Royal Commission sent to Oxford by Queen Elizabeth in 1573, and by the Visitation Articles of Archbishops Grindal and Sandys (York, 1571 and 1578), and Abbot and Laud (1611 and 1637), of Bishops Almyr, Bancroft, and King (London, 1577, 1601, and 1612), and others. The surplice, on the other hand, in a long series of Visitation Articles (sometimes accompanied by Injunctions), of not less than 32 Archbishops and Bishops, of 16 Dioceses in England, commencing with Archbishop Parker in 1567, and ending with Bishop Juxon in 1640, besides various Archdeacons, is consistently treated as the vesture required by law to be used by all ministers of the Church, not only in their other ministrations, but expressly in the administration of both Sacraments.

IX.—THE PURITAN PRAYER BOOK.

Notwithstanding the rigid injunctions that the Book of Common Prayer should be used precisely as set forth by authority, the Puritans, about the year 1578, put forth an unauthorized edition of the work, in which there were some important changes. Among them was the omission of the permission of private Communion, Private Baptism, Confirmation, and the Churching of Women. It was again modified in 1579. These books could not be used publicly without severe penalties. And yet their size and form and rubrical directions seem to indicate that they were intended for public use, where it might be practicable. Besides these modified Books of Common Prayer, there was a book abridged from Calvin's form, by Cartwright and Travers, which the Puritans endeavored to induce the Parliament to substitute in the place of the Prayer Book. Copies of it, printed in London, are still extant. Even after an order of the Star Chamber prohibiting the printing of it, other editions of 1585, '86, '87, and '94, were printed at Middleburg, in the Netherlands, where there was a company of English merchants to whom Cartwright had once ministered. (Liturgical Services of Queen Elizabeth, Intro. 15–19. Proctor's Pr. Bk. 80–5.)

CHAPTER V.

THE PRAYER BOOK IN THE REIGN OF JAMES I.

I.—POSITION OF JAMES I.

King James had been educated under Presbyterian influences; and the Presbyterian party entertained high hopes on his accession. His mind had, however, long chafed under the

Puritan system; and he had never forgotton the indignities to which Knox and his party had subjected his mother. Each party, Presbyterian and Episcopal, sent a person post-haste to James, on the death of Queen Elizabeth. Mr. James Pickering, a zealous Presbyterian, rode day and night, and announced the news first, and sought to gain pledges in behalf of his party before the arrival of Dr. Thomas Neville, the messenger of Whitgift. The latter, however, brought back the welcome message that it was the intention of James to uphold the Church of England as established by law.

"King James had for six years desired to introduce Episcopacy into Scotland. He now, on arriving in England, declared himself a sincere member of the Church of England, and thanked God that he had been brought to the promised land, and to a country where religion was purely professed, and where he sat among learned and grave and reverend men, not as before, a King without State, and without honor, where beardless boys would brave him to his face." (Cardwell's Conferences, p. 136.)

II.—THE MILLENARY PETITION.

Many efforts had been made in Convocation, in the closing year of Queen Elizabeth's reign, to secure some changes in the Prayer Book, by the appointment of a commission; but the Queen was resolutely opposed to and repressed all movements in that direction. An effort to this end was made again in Convocation in the meeting held in 1604, soon after the accession of King James. A petition was presented to the Canterbury Synod for the reformation of the Book of Common Prayer; and the document was presented to the Lower House in the presence of the three petitioners by whom it was prepared. But the petition was unfavorably received, and those who presented it were admonished, by the Prolocutor

of the Lower House, and the Bishops, that they and their adherents should be obedient and conform before the ensuing feast of John the Baptist. (Joyce, Synods, p. 622.)

In consequence of these rebuffs from Convocation, the Puritan party in the Church addressed a petition to the King, called the Millenary petition, signed by upwards of 750 beneficed clergymen, with the title "The humble petition of ministers of the Church of England, desiring a reformation of certain ceremonies and abuses of the Church." Fuller calls it "a calm and still, but deep petition;" and the candid Church historian, Perry, says that "the praise is not undeserved." (Perry, Hist. of Ch. of England, vol. I. 77.) Upon the subject of the Prayer Book, they urged "that of these offences following, some may be removed, some amended, some qualified.

"In the Church service: that the cross in Baptism, interrogatories ministered to infants, Confirmations, as superfluous, may be taken away; Baptism not to be ministered by women, and so explained; the cap and surplice not urged; that examination may go before communion, that it be ministered with a sermon; that divers terms of priest and absolution and some others used, with the ring in marriage, and such other like in the book may be corrected; the longsomeness of the service may be abridged; Church songs and music moderated to better edification; that the Lord's Day be not profaned; the rest upon holidays not so strictly observed; that there may be no uniformity of doctrine prescribed; no Popish opinion to be any more taught or defended; no ministers charged to teach their people to bow at the name of Jesus; that Canonical Scriptures only be read in the Church."

To these suggested sweeping changes in the Prayer Book —some impracticable, some trifling, and some vague—there were added three other subjects for reformation under the

following heads: "Concerning Church ministers — Church livings and Church discipline." The whole petition strikingly illustrates the peculiarities of a party which always seemed incapable of distinguishing between things great and small, and put in peril the loss of that which was important by an equal insistence on what was trifling.

This petition opened with the following statement: "Although divers of us which sue for reformation have formerly in respect of the times subscribed to The Book, some upon protestations, some upon exposition given them, some with conditions, rather than they should be deprived of their labor and ministry, now we, to the number of more than a thousand, your Majesty's subjects and all ministers groaning under a burden of human rites and ceremonies, do, with one joint consent, humble ourselves to your Majesty's feet to be eased and relieved in this behalf."

Fuller explains the discrepancy between the statement that the petitioners numbered one thousand, and the fact that there were but 750 signatures, by stating that the signatures "were collected only out of five and twenty counties;" and "that no doubt the collectors of the names might easily have completed the number."

III.—HAMPTON COURT CONFERENCE.

Queen Elizabeth never would consent to a public discussion of the differences between the Puritan and Church party. King James, learned, loquacious, and fond of discussion and of playing the part of a Royal pedagogue, appointed a Conference at Hampton Court, at which he himself proposed to preside, where the petition should be discussed, and his pleasure made known. The Conference was opened, January 15, 1603–4. On the Episcopal side there were twenty Divines, headed by Archbishop Whitgift, and Bishop Bancroft, of

London. On the Puritan side there were but four Divines, of whom John Reynolds was the most conspicuous. The Episcopal account of the Conference was furnished by Barlow, Dean of Chester, who took part in it. On the Puritan side there is but one brief letter, giving an account of the second day's Conference, by Mr. Galloway, a Scotch divine, who was admitted as a witness. The latter differs from the former account in representing the King as anxious for several changes, but as yielding to the representations of the Church Divines, to the effect that all change was to be deprecated.

IV.—FIRST DAY'S CONFERENCE.

This was a conference of James with the Episcopal divines alone, from whom the King desired satisfaction and information upon certain points. His speech showed a desire to be satisfied with the existing system; but he asked to be informed in reference to several subjects upon which his mind was still in doubt. The points upon which he desired explanation were three: (1) Certain things in the Prayer Book. (2) Excommunication by lay officials. (3) A supply of clergymen for Ireland. On all these topics the explanations and promises of the Bishops and Divines appear to have been satisfactory to the mind of the King: or rather his own dissertations and suggestions seem to have satisfied himself on these points; for he appears to have occupied almost all the time of the conference in the display of his own really large learning on the points in question.

On the subject of Private Baptism by women the King entered upon a discussion which lasted three hours—"so wisely, wittily, learnedly, and with that pretty patience"—says Montague, the Dean of the Royal Chapel, "as I think never man living ever heard the like." He carried his point, and Baptism by women was not thereafter to be allowed.

James in Scotland had laid great stress upon the necessity of Baptism, because lax notions prevailed there on that point; and now he was in a position where he felt that he must argue against views which seemed to imply its necessity for salvation. Speaking of this fact in the conference, he said: "A pert minister asked me if I thought Baptism so necessary that if it were omitted a child should be damned?" I answered: "No, but if you, being called to baptize the child, though privately, should refuse to come, I think you should be damned." (Cardwell, p. 176.)

V.—SECOND DAY'S CONFERENCE.

On the second day's conference Dr. Reynolds arranged the points on which he desired changes into four heads: (1) Doctrine. (2) Appointment of ministers. (3) Book of Common Prayer. (4) Church government. He desired the doctrine of perseverance, and indeed the whole of the Lambeth Articles, to be adopted. At this point Bishop Bancroft became highly excited, and denounced the Puritan divines as schismatics, who should not be heard—quoting an ancient canon to that effect: *Schismatici contra Episcopos not sunt audiendi.* The King reproved the Bishop for his violence, and the discussion was allowed to proceed. King James expressed his great dislike of marginal notes; and gave instances from the Genevan Bible of comments which he called downright Lollardism. Dr. Reynolds also demanded that the rite of Confirmation should not be limited to Bishops. The Catechism was represented as too short; whereupon the explanation of the Sacraments was ordered to be added to the then existing form. From this point he proceeded to the usual Puritan objections against the offices of the Church.

Another of the Puritan divines, Knewstubs, argued against the cross in Baptism, in behalf of the weak brethren, on the

principle of St. Paul in the xivth chapter of Romans. The King asked: "How long he would be weak? Whether forty-five years were not sufficient for them to grow strong? Who were they that pretended to this weakness? For we require not this subscription from laics and idiots, but of preachers and ministers who are not still, I trow, to be fed with milk, but are enabled to feed others. It was to be doubted, but that some of them were strong enough, if not strong headed; and however soever in this case they pretended weakness, yet some in whose behalf they now spoke, thought themselves able to teach him and all the Bishops of the land." "In conclusion," he added, "if this be all they have to say, I shall make them conform themselves, or I will harry them out of this land, or else do worse." (Cardwell, pp. 196–7.)

VI.—THE THIRD DAY'S CONFERENCE.

The meeting of the third day can scarcely be called a Conference. The Bishops brought up their decisions on certain points, which had been submitted to them. The King vindicated the oath *ex officio*, whereby men were forced to accuse themselves, and spoke so earnestly that the Bishops declared he spoke by the special assistance of the Holy Ghost. The changes which resulted from this Conference were a few alterations in the Liturgy, which had at that time no other authority than the King's proclamation. (1) Infant Baptism was limited "to lawful ministers." (2) In the rubric of Absolution, the words, "remission of sins," were added. (3) The explanation of the Sacraments was added to the Catechism. (4) Certain forms of Thanksgiving were added to correspond with *prayers*, "For fair weather," &c.

VII.—RESULTS OF THIS CONFERENCE.

This Conference resulted in the firmer settlement of the Church of England *in statu quo*. The King's feelings were all in favor of the existing system; and he exhibited in the discussion more ability and better temper than either of the two parties between whom he professed to adjudicate. The Bishops and Divines were stiff and uncompromising; the Puritans made many trifling objections. The latter made the great mistake of not pleading for liberty for themselves in matters which they disliked, instead of making the arrogant demand to have them changed, which was obviously a most unlikely thing to be done by those who liked them, and were in the possession of power. They might have seen that the former was at least *possible*, while the latter was too obviously unreasonable to be effected. A party in minority and under subjection may urge with force: "Our conscience will not permit us to accept your system; give us liberty!" but it is preposterous and futile to urge: "Our conscience will not be satisfied unless you adopt our system." Nothing less than the latter was the Puritan demand at this Conference; and of course it was rejected, and left bitterness behind in both parties.

It was not only by an extreme Puritan party that changes in the Prayer Book were desired. Lord Bacon objects to several matters of ceremony: the cap and surplice, the ring in marriage, the use of organs, the form of absolution, lay Baptism, &c. He inveighs against the use of excommunication, against non-residence and pluralities, the oath *ex officio*, the sole exercise of ordination and jurisdiction by the Bishops, conceiving that the Deans and Chapters should assent. And in his predominant spirit of improvement, he asks, Why the civil state should be purged and restored, by good and wholesome laws made every three or four years, in Parliament

assembled, devising remedies as fast as time breedeth mischiefs; and contrariwise the ecclesiastical state should continue upon the dregs of time, and receive no alteration these forty-five years and more. (Hallam's Cons. Hist. of England, vol. 1, p. 295.)

Yet Lord Bacon was by no means blind to the impracticable and pragmatical spirit of the Puritans, while he commended their zeal and devotion. In another place he wrote: "As to any man who shall hereby enter into contempt of their ministry, it is but his own hardness of heart I know the work of exhortation doth chiefly rest upon these men; and they have zeal and hate sin. But again let *them* take heed that be not true, which one of their adversaries said, *They have two small wants, knowledge and love.*" (Cardwell, p. 125.)

Mr. Hallam, commenting on these proceedings, observes that "there is no middle course in dealing with religious sectaries between the persecution which exterminates and the toleration which satisfies"—evidently intending by this *dictum* to express the conviction that toleration should have been extended to the sectaries of the days of Elizabeth and James. (Cons. Hist. of England, vol. 1, p. 219.) The dictum has a philosophical and convincing sound, but it does not apply to the then existing state of things. For (1) toleration would not satisfy the Puritans. They felt bound in conscience to denounce and to labor for the destruction of the existing Episcopal and Ritual system. Nor (2) could it safely be extended to Romanists; for they would have labored with equal conscientiousness not only for the destruction of the existing religious system, but for the overthrow of the existing government, and for bringing in another, which should have owned the supreme authority of a foreign power. That dictum can be properly applicable, so far as it contemplates toleration, only when toleration can be extended with-

out involving a struggle for existence and a probability of overthrow. Nearly two centuries must pass before the principles of mutual toleration will be so widely and cordially embraced by all parties as to make possible in England a toleration which shall at the same time *satisfy*, and be consistent with the preservation and independence of the State.

King James, in a characteristic private letter, thus describes this Conference: "We have kept such a revel of the Puritans here these two days that there never was heard the like. Quaire, I have peppered them as soundly as ye have done the Papists there. It were no reason that they who refuse the airy sign of the cross after Baptism, should have their purses stuffed with any more solid and substantial crosses. They fled me so from argument to argument, without ever answering me directly, *ut est eorum moris*, as I was forced at last to say unto them, that if any of them had been in a college disputing with their scholars, if any of their disciples had answered them in that sort, they would have fetched him up in place of a reply, and so should the rod have plied upon the poor boy's buttocks; but it shall never convert me except by turning me more against them." (Cardwell, p. 161.)

Cardwell's Conferences, chap. 3.
Lathbury's Hist. of the Pr. Br., ch. 7.
Collier's Hist., vol. 7, pp. 272–310.
Neal's Puritans, vol. 1, pp. 227–234.
Fuller's Ch. Hist., vol. 3, pp. 175–195.
Proctor's Pr. Bk., chap. 4.

CHAPTER VI.

THE PRAYER BOOK FROM 1604 TO 1662.

I.—ALLEGED CHANGES IN THE PRAYER BOOK BY ARCHBISHOP LAUD.

In an edition of the Prayer Book of 1638, and in some others, the word *priest* is substituted for *minister*. In the prayer for the Royal family, the words "Almighty God Who hast promised to be the Father of thine elect, and of their seed," are changed to "Almighty God, the fountain of all goodness." In the service for the 5th of November, "Cut off those workers of iniquity whose religion is rebellion," is changed into, "who turned religion into rebellion." This is supposed to have been done in order to make the sentence apply to the Puritans as well as to the Romanists. It was charged upon Archbishop Laud, that these changes were made by his direction. But, in his trial, he explicitly and solemnly denied it. The prayer for the Royal family was introduced by the proclamation of King James, and might, therefore, be lawfully altered by Charles I.; and the service for the 5th of November is not appointed by act of Parliament. The day is ordered to be kept holy, but no service was appointed. (Laud on the Liturgy and Episcopacy, pp. 343–401. Short's History of Church of England, §§ 747–8. Cardwell's Conferences, pp. 229–37.)

The changes in the Prayer Book, issued during the supremacy of Laud, follow no regular rule; and there is no authority for attributing them to him. If he had been tenacious of retaining the word *priest* instead of *minister*, we should have found it uniformly in the successive editions of the Prayer Book; and we would not have found him acquiescing in the

substitution of the word *presbyter* for *priest*, wherever it occurred in the Scotch Liturgy. The edition of 1607 has the word *priest*, that of 1627 *minister*, and again, the editions of 1625, 1632, and 1633 have the word *priest;* but, again, in the editions of 1634 and 1639, the word is *minister*.

"The innovations of Laud were not, as it is sometimes vaguely charged, changes of rubrics or expressions in the Prayer Book; but in the new position of Communion tables altar-wise, and in the addition of much ceremonialism in the prescribed offices of the Church. The excess to which he carried the latter appears from the account of his consecration of the Church of St. Catherine." (Perry [quoted from Rushworth, vol. 2, p. 77], vol. 1, p. 443.) "First there was a pause made before the closed western doors; then a voice exclaimed, 'open, open ye everlasting doors, that the King of glory may come in!' Then the Bishop and some doctors and other principal men went in, and the Bishop falling down on his knees, with his eyes lifted up and his hands spread abroad, uttered these words: 'This place is holy, the ground is holy, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I pronounce it holy.' As he approached the Communion table he made several lowly bowings; and coming to the side of the table, where the bread and wine were covered, he bowed seven times; and then after the reading of many prayers, he came near the bread, and gently lifted up the corner of the napkin, wherein the bread was laid, and when he beheld the bread, he laid it down again, flew back a step or two, bowed three several times towards it; then he drew near again and opened the napkin and bowed as before. Then he laid his hand upon the cup, which was full of wine, with a cover upon it, which he let go again, went back and bowed thrice toward it; and then he came near again, and, lifting up the cover of the cup, looked into it, and seeing the wine he let fall the cover again,

went back and bowed as before." (Butler's Eccl. History, vol. 2, p. 497.)

The peculiarity of this extraordinary performance is, that, so far as it appears from the narrative, all this consternated awe and reverence seem to have been paid to the elements *before consecration*. If that were so—and it seems incredible—one wonders what further expressions of awe the Archbishop could have introduced after consecration. On either supposition such excessive manifestations at the administration of the Lord's Supper on the part of the highest dignitary in the Church, could not have failed to foster much hitherto unauthorized or discarded ceremonialism, in the performance of the Divine service.*

II.—THE SCOTCH LITURGY.

In Scotland the English Liturgy had been used from 1557 to 1564. Knox set it aside and introduced his own "Book of Common Order." James I., visiting Scotland in 1617, introduced the English Liturgical service in his own Chapel of Holyrood, where it was performed with great pomp. But the arrangements of the Chapel, in which he had introduced gilded statues of the twelve Apostles, created so much clamor—especially the gilded Apostles—that the King was compelled

* It seems curious, after reading the above, to find Laud issuing Visitation Articles in 1628, one of which is as follows: "Whether there be in your parish any who are known or suspected to conceal or keep hid in their houses any Mass Books, Breviaries, or other books of Popery or superstition, or any chalices, *copes, vestments, albs*, or other ornaments of superstition uncancelled or undefaced, which is to be conjectured *they keep for a day*, as they call it," *i. e.*, for the hoped-for return of the superstitious service of the Church of Rome. Certainly Laud cannot be adduced as a believer in the lawfulness, much less the obligation, of the vestments.

to remove them. He complained "that they would admit the figures of griffons, monsters, and devils, and refuse those of the twelve Apostles."

After having prepared the way for its reception by the five Articles of Perth (Perry, Vol. 1, p. 457), a Prayer Book for Scotland was composed by some Bishops, under the supervision of the King. But though the Scottish Bishops were enjoined to introduce it, nothing was done in the matter until the fourth year of Charles I. The Scottish Bishops did not wholly approve the English Book, and preferred to prepare one for themselves. The Book, however, which they prepared, was almost identical with the English Liturgy, and received the approbation and sanction of Archbishop Laud. But such was the state of feeling that it could not be enforced. The attempt to use it in the Cathedral Church in Edinburgh ended in a riot, in which a stool was thrown by an old woman at the officiating Dean, and from which he and the Bishop of Edinburgh escaped with difficulty with their lives.

The most important points in which the Book differs from the English is the introduction of the invocation and oblation in the Communion service from the first Book of Edward, and the substitution of the word *presbyter* for *priest* wherever the latter occurred. Thus, it is seen that the apparent anomaly of an Episcopal Church without a Liturgy, was exhibited in Scotland for several years. (Proctor, pp. 93–6.)

III.—CHANGES PROPOSED IN 1641.

In consequence of the increase of Puritanism attempts were made to lessen its hostility by the suggestion of some important changes in the Prayer Book. A committee was appointed in the House of Lords for this purpose; at the head of which was placed Bishop Williams. It conceded many of the points to which the Puritans had objected. But it soon

became evident that nothing less than the entire abolition of Episcopacy and the Prayer Book would satisfy the now dominant party. The attempt at concession was abandoned; but it was not forgotten by non-Conformists that such alterations had once been offered by persons of high name and station in the Church. The use of the Prayer Book in public and in private was forbidden in 1645; all copies of it were ordered to be delivered up, and heavy penalties imposed upon all offenders. (Proctor, 97–101. Cardwell's Congress, 242.)

IV.—THE PRAYER BOOK AND THE CHURCH DURING THE COMMONWEALTH.

During the civil war there was a great destruction of all that was distinctive of Episcopal worship. Stained windows, organs, ornamented tombs, vestments, Prayer Books, fonts, and almost everything connected with the former system, were destroyed as Popish trumpery. When the Long Parliament assembled, the Liturgy was still used by some. The covenant was adopted in 1643. In 1644, Christmas was declared by Act of Parliament abolished. On the 1st of June, 1644, the Prysbyterian Directory was adopted by the General Assembly, and the Prayer Book prohibited; yet the Prayer Book continued to be used by many persons in secret. Such of the Episcopal clergy as remained in their livings were accustomed to frame their public prayers on the model of the Liturgy. Bishop Sanderson continued to use the whole of it when no soldiers were present in the congregation. When soldiers were present, he used portions of it from memory. Jeremy Taylor pursued a similar course. In Ireland it continued to be used later than in England. Archbishop Usher continued to use it privately in the house of the Countess of Peterborough, as long as he lived. Though superseded by the Directory, the Prayer Book was also prohibited by Cromwell in 1655. (Lathbury, History of Prayer Book, chapter xii.)

V.—THE DIRECTORY.

The Directory sets forth the general order of public worship, and the manner in which the sacraments and the occasional rites should be administered; but the details are left to the discretion of the officiating minister. It directs that prayer shall commence in reverence and humility; that the Holy Scriptures shall then be read and followed by an exposition; then a Psalm sung, then a prayer, then the sermon, prayer, Psalm or hymn, and benediction. Directions are also given for the administration of Baptism, the Lord's Supper, marriage, visitation of the sick, burial of the dead, and days of fasting and thanksgiving.

VI.—WORSHIP AND PREACHING DURING THE COMMONWEALTH.

The confusion, irreverence, and fanaticism which prevailed during the Commonwealth, furnished perhaps the strongest argument ever presented for the use of forms of prayers. A striking picture of the state of things during this period is furnished in the twelfth and thirteenth chapters of Lathbury's History of the Book of Common Prayer.

VII.—REVISION OF THE PRAYER BOOK, 1662.

1. *Address of the Non Conformists to the King.*—A deputation of Non-Conformists was sent to the King at the Hague, to persuade him not to allow the Prayer Book and the ceremonies of the Church to be again introduced. Failing in this effort, and in the attempt to induce him to disuse them in his own chapel, they presented to him an address, in which they expressed a desire that a Liturgy not liable to the objections made to the Prayer Book might be prepared. They object to kneeling at the sacrament, to holy days, to surplices, to the cross, and to bowing at the name of Jesus. The Bishops,

in reply, pronounce the offices of the Prayer Book unexceptionable, and contend for a strict conformity. Yet they consent to a review of the Liturgy in case his Majesty should deem it expedient.

2. *The King's declaration concerning Ecclesiastical affairs.*—In Oct. 25th, 1660, the King issued a declaration which was very satisfactory to the Puritans, although the sincerity of it, in view of his subsequent proceedings, may well be doubted. The greatest latitude was allowed to them for the present, and the whole question of the final settlement of Ecclesiastical affairs was to be submitted to a conference of divines, and to the decision of Parliament and the Convocation.

"When we were in Holland," said the King in his declaration, "we were attended by many grave and learned ministers from hence, who were looked upon as the most able and principal asserters of the Presbyterian opinions; and with whom we had as much conference as the multitude of affairs which were then upon us would permit us to have; and for our great satisfaction and comfort found these persons full of affection to us, of zeal for the peace of the Church and the State, and neither enemies, as they have been given out to be, to Episcopacy or Liturgy; but modestly to desire such alterations in either, as without shaking foundations might best allay the present distemper, which the indisposition of the time, and the tenderness of some men's consciences had contracted." (English Puritanism, Documents, p. 65.)

3. *The Savoy Conference.*—The warrant for the conference was issued in March, 1661. Twelve Bishops and twelve Presbyterians, and nine divines on each side as assistants, were appointed and met in the Bishop of London's lodgings in the Savoy Hospital. The two principal Bishops who took an active part in the proceedings were Sheldon, Bishop of London, and Morley, Bishop of Winchester. On the Presbyterian side Baxter was the leading controversialist, and dis-

putant in the oral conferences. But, much to the disappointment of the Presbyterians, the Bishops proposed that they should reduce their objections to writing. Baxter was induced to accede to this demand. A committee of Presbyterians was appointed to bring in "Exceptions," and Baxter charged himself with bringing in "additions." These exceptions and additions were very numerous and many of them trifling, and calculated to make the Episcopal party impatient, and to conclude that it would be quite impossible to satisfy the Puritan party without surrender of everything distinctive of the Liturgy as it had been established and used for more than a century. The answers of the Bishops are known only by the rejoinder of Baxter in which they are embodied. After a conference which continued nearly three months the demands of the Presbyterians were rejected, and only such changes introduced as the Episcopal divines themselves judged to be necessary or expedient. Everything conspired to bring about this unfortunate issue, which resulted in the expulsion of 2000 ministers from their parishes on St. Bartholomew's day, and to the passing and rigid enforcement of those successive "Acts"—"the corporation," "conventicle," and "five mile" Acts—which led to so much lamentable persecution and suffering. Among the causes which led to a failure were:—

(1) The want of wisdom and moderation on the part of the Presbyterian divines. The Puritans, at the Hampton Court Conference, demanded but comparatively few changes in the Liturgy. But the very great number of those demanded at the Savoy Conference made concession impossible without a complete surrender. That certainly was not to be expected of a triumphant party, just put in possession of power, after having been long excluded from toleration, and having been subjected to many disabilities and sufferings.

(2) The uncompromising attitude of the Episcopal Com-

missioners. The unreasonableness of the other party led the Episcopal Commission to adopt a haughty and impassive bearing, which did but confirm their opponents in the opinion that there was a foregone determination to grant them no redress. They "assumed the port and manner of persons who were in the ascendant, and had to do with troublesome people come to ask disagreeable favors." The King's coronation occurred during the sitting of this Conference, and the tide of loyalty towards the throne and all that was associated with and supported it ran deep and strong. There was little disposition at such a time, and in such a state of feeling, to consider dispassionately "exceptions" and "additions" to exceptions to the Prayer Book, which extended to two or three hundred solid pages. (See English Puritans, Documents, pp. 1–379.)

(3) The time at which the Conference was held was not favorable to friendly feeling or a spirit of mutual concession. If this conference had been held immediately after the restoration of the King, and while his pledges were yet fresh in the minds of the people, it is possible that a more conciliatory tone on the part of the Episcopal divines and a more reasonable one on the part of the Presbyterians might have led to more concessions, if not to an amicable arrangement. Says Dr. Stoughton (Church and State, two hundred years ago, p. 152), "A meeting at the Savoy between the divines of the two schools to consult about the revision of the Prayer Book in the spring of 1660 would have been a perfectly different affair from such a meeting in the spring of 1661. Something at least like equal terms of conference might at the former date have been secured, though presbyters were then beginning to give way to priests; but at the later date, it is plain to everybody now, that the men of the School of Geneva stood no chance whatever with the men of the School of Canterbury."

4. *Changes in the Prayer Book.*—The numerous changes introduced by the Episcopal Commissioners into the Prayer Book leave it unchanged as to all its distinctive features. The following are the most important. The sentences, the Gospels, and other portions of the Bible (except the Psalter, the Ten Commandments, and other portions of the Communion Service) were taken generally from the version of 1611. The absolution was to be pronounced by the *priest* alone, and not by the *minister*. The Book of Bel and the Dragon was re-inserted in the Calendar of Lessons. The Evening Service, which previously began with the Lord's Prayer, was now arranged like the Morning Prayer. In the Litany the words *rebellion* and *schism* were added to the petition respecting sedition and privy conspiracy. In another petition the words "Bishops, Priests, and Deacons" were employed, instead of "Bishops, Pastors, and Ministers of the Church." Among the occasional prayers and thanksgivings were now inserted a second prayer for fair weather, the two prayers for Ember Weeks, the prayer for Parliament and all conditions of men, a Thanksgiving for restoring public peace at home, and the General Thanksgiving. New collects were appointed for the third Sunday in Advent and St. Stephen's day. Some collects were revised and improved, and the word "*Church*" was substituted for "Congregation." In the order for burial the first rubric respecting persons unbaptized or excommunicated was added. A Service for Adult Baptism and one for use at sea were introduced. Dr. Tenison computed that there were about six hundred alterations made in the Prayer Book by the Convocation of 1662, which were ratified by the Act of Uniformity. All clergymen were required not only to adopt the Liturgy thus altered, and to declare, if they had not hitherto conformed, the unlawfulness of their past conduct; and if they had been ordained by other than Bishops, to submit to Episcopal ordination. (Cardwell's Conferences, pp. 141–2, §§ 380–6.)

CHAPTER VII.

VARIOUS ATTEMPTS TO REVISE AND MODIFY AND SUPERSEDE THE ENGLISH LITURGY.

I.—IRREGULARITIES DURING THE REIGN OF CHARLES II.

Notwithstanding that the Ritual and ceremonies of the Church of England were fixed by law, the irregularities in the service during the reign of Charles II. were very great. Charles himself was a disguised Romanist, and even as such a Gallio, and therefore not at all earnest in enforcing conformity. Many of the leading non-Conformists were men of learning, ability, and high character, and more moderate in their demands for change than the Puritans of the days of James I. A severe and rigid execution of the Act of Uniformity would, therefore, have been very obnoxious to a large portion of the people, and not altogether safe for the Government. In consequence of this state of things, while avowed and open non-conformity was often severely dealt with, much irregularity on the part of reluctant Conformists prevailed, and was sometimes connived at or ignored by the Ecclesiastical authorities. Consequently, as Lathbury declares, "Never were greater irregularities permitted by Bishops than during the reign of Charles II. Subscription was considered sufficient, and conformity to the Rubrics left to the inclination of individuals." Some of the reluctant Conformists employed curates to read prayers, while they preached and used long extempore prayers, before and after the sermon. Others omitted the surplice and dispensed with kneeling at the Sacrament. Baxter describes these variations, and urges them as a reason for the legal toleration of the Presbyterian worship.

"One parish minister prayeth in the pulpit, and another only biddeth prayer. One useth a form, and another varieth according to the matter of his sermon. One sitteth at the singing of a Psalm, and another standeth up. One receiveth the Lord's Supper kneeling, and then standeth to eat and drink it. And as to practice, we come not into two Churches of ten, where just all the same prayers and parts of the Litany are daily read; but one readeth more and another less; one this part and another that." There was also a diversity among those who used all the service in the method of performing the Ante-Communion service. Some read it at the Communion Table, and some at the Reading Desk. This was the subject of many earnest controversies. (Lathbury's Hist. of the C. P. Bk. 389–409.)

II.—MOVEMENTS FOR THE RELIEF OF DISSENTERS DURING THE REIGN OF CHARLES II.

In 1668 Doctors Stillingfleet and Tillotson united with the leaders of the Non-conformists, Bates, Manton and Baxter, in devising a bill for the comprehension of Dissenters, in accordance with the principles of the King's declaration from Breda. But though recommended by a speech from the throne, the Commons rejected it by a large majority. In 1673 and 1675 motions were again made for the relief of Dissenters. Tillotson declined to join in them any further, because they seemed to be quite hopeless; but Stillingfleet continued them after he became Bishop of Worcester in 1681. He proposed that the surplice, the sign of the cross, sponsors, kneeling at the Communion, and some other matters should be left optional. But, even if the Parliament would have granted these concessions, many of the Dissenters would have been unwilling to accept them. They suspected—and in the reign of James II. their suspicions were confirmed—

that toleration was offered to them for the purpose of bringing in equal toleration of Popery. They preferred to remain themselves proscribed, rather than that Popery and Socinianism should be tolerated.

III.—DECLARATION OF WILLIAM, PRINCE OF ORANGE, IN FAVOR OF NON-CONFORMISTS.

When William of Orange departed for England, he issued a declaration of his purpose "to endeavor a good agreement between the Church of England and the Protestant Dissenters, and to cover and secure all who would live peaceably under one government from all persecution on account of their religion." He desired also, the comprehension of the Dissenters in the established Church. That proposal was rejected; but, on his accession, for the first time since the Reformation, a free toleration of Protestant Dissenters was allowed, with the exception of those who rejected the doctrine of the Trinity.

IV.—ATTEMPTS TO REVISE THE LITURGY IN THE REIGN OF WILLIAM AND MARY.

A commission of ten Bishops and twenty Divines was appointed, Sept. 16, 1689, "to prepare such alterations of the Liturgy and Canons, and such proposals for the reformation of Ecclesiastical Courts, and to consider such other matters as might most conduce to the good and unity and edification of the Church of England, and to the reconciling as much as possible of all differences." On the same day Tillotson drew up a paper of concessions, which would probably be made by the Church of England for the union of Protestants. The heads of the paper were as follows: —

1. Ceremonies to be left indifferent.

2. To review the Liturgy and remove all grounds of exceptions; to leave out the Apocryphal lessons, and correct the translation of the Psalms.

3. Ministers to subscribe only one general declaration of submission to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Church of England.

4. To make a new body of Canons.

5. To reform the Ecclesiastical Courts.

6. That those ordained in foreign Reformed Churches shall not be re-ordained in order to render them capable of preferment in the Church.

7. None to be capable of Ecclesiastical preferment that shall be ordained in England otherwise than by Bishops. The changes proposed in the Prayer Book were in harmony with these principles; but they were not even presented in the Convocation. The Lower House showed unmistakably that they were opposed to these changes proposed by the Court and the Bishops. The downfall of the Episcopacy in Scotland, and the intolerance of the established Presbyterian Church there towards it, prevented many concessions which might otherwise have been made to the Dissenters in England. Moreover the free toleration now granted seemed to render fresh concessions less necessary, however advantageous they might have proved to the Church of England. (Proctor, 144–60; Cardwell's Conferences, chapter ix.; Book of Common Prayer, interpaged with the revised Liturgy of 1689.)

V.—NON-JUROR'S LITURGY.

Archbishop Sancroft, with eight Bishops and four hundred Clergymen, who would not take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary, were all ejected from their benefices. These Non-Jurors denied the Episcopal Commission of those who occupied the place of the deprived Bishops during their

lifetime. They effected an actual separation by ministering privately among those who held their opinions, and by ordaining Presbyters and consecrating Bishops. In the year 1717 they presented a new office called "the Form and Manner of the Holy Communion," which was nearly identical with that of the first Book of Edward. In the following year they published their own office; in this office they adopted what were called "The *usages;*" viz.: the mixing of water with the wine, prayers for the dead, prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost on the elements, and the prayer of oblation. They adopted also three other ceremonies which were also called usages; viz.: trine immersion, the use of chrism in baptism, and unction at the visitation of the sick. In 1734, Deacon, a prominent Non-Juror, published a large octavo volume, comprising a complete collection of devotions both public and private. They were taken from the Apostolic Constitutions, the ancient Liturgies, and the Liturgy of the Church of England. The Non-Jurors were not completely extinct until towards the close of the last century. (Lathbury's History of the Non-Jurors.)

VI.—THE ARIAN AND SOCINIAN PRAYER BOOK.

Dr. Samuel Clarke, an Arian, at one time Chaplain to Queen Anne, sketched a scheme for a revised Prayer Book in accordance with his views of the Trinity. His suggestion was acted upon in 1785, when a Liturgy collected principally from the Book of Common Prayer for the use of the first Episcopal Church in Boston, was published in Boston and in England. This, as Proctor says, was Arianized by Clarke and Socinianized by Lindsey. The objectionable passages of the Psalms are printed in italics to be omitted in public worship. A similar book was prepared by the English residents of Dunkirk. This book is still printed in England. Its

variations from the established book are often subtle and scarcely distinguishable. The absolution and the creeds and the first invocations in the Litany are omitted. The mention of Satan, hell, everlasting damnation, false doctrine, heresy and schism, the Holy Church universal, and the Holy Spirit, is avoided. The occasional offices and the Communion office are much mutilated. (Proctor, 164–67.)

VII.—PETITION FOR A REVISION IN 1772.

A petition was presented to Archbishop Cornwallis this year by several clergymen, some of whom afterwards obtained high stations in the Church, viz., Drs. Porteus, York, and Percy, who were subsequently Bishops of London, Ely, and Dromore, "to sanction a review of the Articles and Liturgy, with a request that their wishes might be signified to the rest of the Bishops, in order that everything might be prudently and safely done to promote these important and salutary purposes."

The Archbishop replied early the next year, "I have consulted severally with my brethren, the Bishops, and it is the opinion of the bench in general that nothing can be done in the matter which has been submitted to their consideration." This was commonly spoken of as "the feather's petition," from having been held in the "Prince's Feathers Tavern," in London.

"The petition was the less likely to prevail because of one presented the previous year to Parliament for abolishing *all* subscriptions to the Creeds and Articles. That petition had been headed by Archdeacon Blackburn, and subscribed by a number of Latitudinarian and Arian clergy, like himself anxious to be liberated from all doctrinal obligations. The other petition, coming so soon after, although from a very different set of men, would naturally be regarded as part of

a general movement for a radical change in the constitution of the Church of England." (Perry's History of the Church of England, Vol. 3, p. 417.)

VIII.—EXPRESSIONS OF DESIRE FOR A REVISION OF THE LITURGY BY LEADING ENGLISH DIVINES.

Bishop Burnet objected to the form, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," in the Ordination Office, and to the authoritative absolution in the Visitation of the sick. Dr. Prideaux expostulated against the damnatory sentences in the Athanasian Creed. Archbishop Tillotson "wished we were well rid of the Athanasian Creed." Archbishop Secker declared that "the Liturgy could be made more elegant, more correct, more copious and shorter, and it ought to be made so." Dr. Tomline, Bishop of Lincoln (1790–1800), also objected to the Athanasian Creed. So also did Dr. Watson, Bishop of Landaff (1816). Dr. Coplestone, Bishop of the same Diocese (1833), specified many particulars in which he thought the Liturgy could be improved, and desired either a revision or a limited discretion, in the use of some parts of the service, on the part of the officiating minister. Dr. Bloomfield, late Bishop of London, writes: "If I were asked what my opinion is as to the expediency of attempting alteration of the Liturgy, I should be deficient in candor, if I did not acknowledge that I think the Liturgy capable of improvement. It would be little short of a miracle if it were not so. I know not why I should be ashamed or reluctant to avow an opinion which was entertained by Sancroft, Stillingfleet, and Tenison, and Wake, and Secker, and Porteus." Archdeacon Hare (1835–40) wished that some double forms of prayer might be introduced for the use of scrupulous consciences. Archbishop Sumner (1854) declared it to be his opinion "that alterations might be advisable in *many things* connected with

the Church. There might be improvements in many parts of the excellent Liturgy." He desired a commission of ten or twenty persons to consider and report upon the subject. In 1860 he avowed his approval of some of the changes introduced into the American Book of Common Prayer. Dean Milman, and Dr. Griffin, Bishop of Limerick, and Dr. Baring, late Bishop of Durham, have all expressed emphatically their desire for revision.

IX.—RECENT EFFORTS MADE IN CONVOCATION FOR THE REVISION OF THE PRAYER BOOK.

Several efforts have been made in Convocation since 1854, to secure the sanction of that body to some changes in the Prayer Book; but they have been, for the most part, unsuccessful. The most urgent petitions presented to that body, have been for a modification of the Burial Service, and for the removal or the optional use of the Athanasian Creed. Large majorities in both houses have pronounced against most of the changes proposed. In 1854, Dr. Bloomfield, Bishop of London, presented a report advocating permission to divide the Morning Service on Sundays when the Communion is administered, and recommended for adoption several new occasional prayers. In 1857, an appeal by petition against the use of the Service of the Burial of the Dead over openly profane persons was dismissed, and relief was declared impracticable. In 1858, several of the Bishops admitted that they desired alterations and abridgment of the services for week-days, but in a body they declared that the Sunday services should not be altered, or the integrity of the Prayer Book in any way impaired. In the Lower House, in 1858, a committee presented a report, that some modifications of Church rules should be made to enable the Church to minister more successfully to the spiritual wants of the people;

and several changes with this end in view were proposed. In 1861, also, a motion was made for a similar object. It proposed that repetitions be avoided—the Psalter rearranged—the Athanasian Creed left optional—and the addition of some occasional prayers, similar to those proposed by Bishop Bloomfield in 1854. All these measures were defeated by large majorities.

X.—TWO BILLS INTRODUCED INTO PARLIAMENT IN 1862 BY LORD EBURY.

Lord Ebury in 1862 introduced into the House of Lords a permissive bill for amending the public services. This bill proposed no changes in the services themselves; but gave great liberty in the way of omission and re-distribution. The alterations all came within what is called structural revision. None of them touched doctrines. Their general tendency was towards an abbreviation of the services. There was nothing compulsory in the bill. It was wholly permissive. It contemplated the omission of the Litany and the Ante-Communion Service, at the discretion of the minister. It provided for avoiding the repetition of the Lord's Prayer, and prayers for the Queen. It provided for preaching on some occasions without the full service. The second bill provided for a less stringent form of subscription to the Act of Uniformity, and proposed the form of subscription similar to that adopted in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. The latter motion was supported by fifty Peers. The former was withdrawn in consequence of a vigorous attack upon it by the Bishop of Oxford, and the certainty, on the part of the mover, that it would be defeated by a large majority. (The Ingoldsby Letters, Vol. 2, 307–24.)

XI.—ASSOCIATION IN LONDON FOR PROMOTING THE REVISION OF THE PRAYER BOOK.

This Association is established for the purpose of securing, *first*, the structural revision provided by Lord Ebury's bill; and *second*, for a doctrinal revision. It numbers many Clerical and Lay Associates in London, and has several affiliated societies in the large towns. It seeks chiefly a relaxation of the terms of subscription, a change of the formula of the ordination service, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," &c., a modification of the Baptismal Service, and the omission of the positive absolution in the Visitation of the sick. Under its auspices the Prayer Book remodelled has been published (1860, by Longman & Co.), and also in 1863, "The Prayer Book as it might be," by the Rev. R. Bingham.

Up to this period the attempt to secure any authorized Rubrical relaxation or revision of the Liturgy in the Church of England, would seem to show the justice of Dr. Paley's famous declaration made nearly a hundred years ago: —

"As a man who attacks a flourishing establishment writes with a halter about his neck, few will be found ever to attempt alterations, but men of more spirit than prudence, of more sincerity than caution, of warm, eager, and impetuous tempers; and, consequently, if we are to wait for improvement till the cool and calm and discreet part of mankind begin it, till Church governors solicit or ministers of state propose it, I venture to pronounce that (without His interposition with Whom nothing is impossible) we may remain as we are till the renovation of all things."

XII.—ROYAL COMMISSION ON RITUAL.

Perhaps in consequence of the above movements, a Royal Commission on Ritual was appointed, at the head of which

was placed the Archbishop of Canterbury. Members of the Catholic school, as they call themselves, in the Church, have presented to this Commission suggestions for a Catholic revision of the Prayer Book. From a letter of the Rev. Dr. Littledale, a leading man of this school, its desires may be ascertained. Dr. Littledale laments the loss of many Catholic truths and usages, and the mutilation of others. He suggests a revision of the Lectionary, an addition to the number of Saints to the Calendar, and the restoration of the Corpus Christi and All Souls' Days, which he says are now openly and extensively observed in the Church of England. He would omit the Confession and the *quasi-Absolution*, as he calls it, which he considers worthless, and a Puritan innovation of 1552, quite contrary to the true theory of Catholic worship. He would have a double confession of both priest and people. Especially does he desire radical changes in the Communion office.

Of this last point he writes as follows: "It is impossible for any English Liturgical scholar to behold it in its present condition and compare it with the glorious rite of Sarum, or even Edward VI.'s First Book, without being bowed down with grief, shame, and indignation, at the enormous wrong-doing which was perpetrated, and the apathy with which it has been so long regarded. The word *altar* needs to be restored. The importance of lights is this: Lights in the daytime are contrary to the order of nature, and they thus testify to the supernatural character of the ordinances. The Decalogue should be struck out of the Eucharistic office, with which it has no concern. The *Gloria in Excelsis* may be retained, because it now forms such a magnificent testimony to the real presence." He desires that the Sacrament may be reserved. "What can a priest do," he writes, "coming into a room with absolutely no furniture, not a table, a chair, a box, nor even a window-sill; and with nothing but a heap of shavings in a

corner by way of bed? I ask your Grace, how can a priest consecrate in such circumstances?" He concludes thus: "I would fain repeat, that we are content to let things remain as they are; but if a change does come, we ask protection for our consciences. And in truth there is nothing unreasonable in the notion of a variety of Liturgies in one communion. We are in full communion with the American Church, though its Prayer Book differs from ours. We had Sarum, York, Bangor, and Hereford Use once ourselves, and France, even late within the present century, had a great variety of Diocesan formularies. I am disposed to believe, as a private thinker, that it would be better to have such variety once more, provided some limits were fixed, and that the primary doctrines of faith were not contradicted or ignored, than that two schools within the Church should be living, as now, a life of moral contradiction, and the remaining should be obstructed in its task of declaring the whole counsel of God."

Nothing resulted immediately at the time from the appointment of this commission, although the discussions and conferences then held have, no doubt, led to some changes that have more recently been made.

XIII.—METHODS OF MODIFYING THE SERVICES OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

The only constitutional method of legislating for the Church Liturgy and ceremonies, recognized for more than two hundred years, was that Canons and Rubrics and Articles should originate and be passed in Convocation, and then confirmed by Parliament and the Crown. But in consequence of violent disputations in the Convocation, and of conflicting views as to the respective prerogatives of Convocation and the Crown, in 1717, the functions of the former were practically suspended for more than a hundred and fifty years.

Consequently no new Canons or Rubrics could be enacted during the period. But within the last few years, the Convocation has again been permitted to meet, and has recommended some measures which have been sanctioned by Parliament and the Crown; and it is believed that but for the wide party differences, which now unhappily prevail, Convocation would soon be restored to all its original functions. In consequence of this virtual suspension of the Convocation, Parliament has sometimes assumed the power of directly originating and enacting Church regulations. The deeply-felt necessity of adapting the Church to the changes which two centuries have brought about since the Liturgy was fixed in its present form, is gradually bringing about important additions to, if not modifications of, the existing Church regulations. Among the most important of these changes are the new and much improved Lectionary, and the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act, commonly known as the Shortened Services Act. The latter provides for abbreviated forms for Daily Service. Under the authority which Bishops possess of providing services and prayers for special occasions, and of using only the Litany on occasions of performing Episcopal functions, much relief and greatly added impressiveness and propriety in many services have been obtained. The recent re-organization of Diocesan Synods promises also to be exceedingly useful and effective, through the introduction of practical measures, for carrying out and giving new vigor and wider influence to the public services of the Church. (Hope's Worship in the Church of England, p. 24.)

CHAPTER VIII.

THE PRAYER BOOK OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

I.—THE QUESTION OF A LITURGY IN THE FIRST GENERAL CONVENTION OF 1785.

On the 25th of September, 1785, the First General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church was held in Philadelphia. There were deputies from seven States, viz.: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina. Among the important questions which demanded consideration, that of the changes which should be introduced into the Prayer Book was one of the most urgent. It had been proposed in New York, in the previous year, that only such changes should be made as had become necessary by the altered political circumstances of the country. The Church in Virginia authorized its deputies to join in the review of the Prayer Book; and the wish for some alterations in many of the Offices was general. "A moderate review," says Bishop White, "fell in with the sentiments and wishes of every member." But some suggestions of change were rather startling. Mr. Page, of Virginia, proposed to strike out the first four petitions in the Litany, on the ground that the word Trinity is not found in Scripture. This proposal did not prevail. But there were some animated discussions on justification, predestination, original sin, and various Rubrics and Liturgical expressions. A committee, consisting of Drs. White, Smith, and Wharton, was appointed to review the Prayer Book in accordance with what was supposed, after these discussions, to be the views of the Convention, and

report to the next Convention. (Bishop White's Memoirs, pp. 102–8.)

II.—SERVICE FOR THE FOURTH OF JULY.

A resolution was adopted for framing a service for the Fourth of July. It was opposed by Dr. White. He says that it was the most injudicious step taken by the Convention. And yet Dr. White, who opposed the adoption of the service, was one of the very few persons by whom it was performed.

III.—THE PROPOSED PRAYER BOOK.

The Committee appointed to review the Prayer Book had been authorized to make verbal alterations, but not to go beyond what had been agreed upon by the Convention. But the importunities of some of the clergy, and their assurances that such a course would be acceptable to all, induced them to go further and to introduce some changes in which important points of doctrine were involved. Only selections from the Psalms were made, and combined into continuous and unbroken parts—one for the morning and one for the evening. Twenty only of the XXXIX Articles were adopted, and some of them much modified. Both the Athanasian and the Nicene Creeds were omitted. The Ordinal was entirely omitted—with a view to being put forth in a separate book. The Book was printed and submitted to the Conventions of the several Dioceses for revision and acceptance. Hence it was called the "*Proposed Book.*" Dr. White regarded its publication as premature, both because it was hastily prepared, and upon objections and changes being made would need to be again printed; and because he feared the effect of the publication on the minds of the English Bishops, to whom application had been made for the Episcopate.

IV.—EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE PRAYER BOOK, ON THE PROSPECT OF OBTAINING THE EPISCOPATE FROM THE ENGLISH BISHOPS.

The proposed changes, through some neglect, were not communicated to the English Bishops. An exaggerated impression of their radical character was conveyed through public rumor, and the private correspondence of some of the Eastern clergy. The influence of these representations on the minds of the English Bishops is seen in their answer to the application of the Convention. They close a courteous letter, received early in 1786, in the following words: "While we are anxious to give every proof not only of our brotherly affection, but of our facility in forwarding your wishes, we cannot but be extremely cautious lest we should be instruments of establishing an Ecclesiastical system, which will be called a branch of the Church of England, but afterwards may possibly appear to have departed from it essentially, either in doctrine or in discipline." Soon after this letter was dispatched, the Proposed Prayer Book was received and carefully examined by the two Archbishops. In a letter to the Convention they express their regret at many unnecessary verbal changes, the entire omission of two Creeds, and the mutilation of a third. Nevertheless they had agreed to present a bill to Parliament, and hoped soon to be able to consecrate Bishops for the United States. In the mean time they expressed the hope that the Convention would restore the Apostles' Creed to its integrity, introduce the two other Creeds, even if their use should be made discretional. They objected also to the provision of the Constitution which made the clergy, and even the Bishops, accountable to the mixed lay and clerical assembly.

V.—RECEPTION OF THE PROPOSED BOOK DURING THE SPRING OF 1786.

The proposed Prayer Book was considered by the Conventions in the several States. Everywhere it proved a subject of controversy, and appeared likely to endanger the union of the Churches. In New York nothing was decided on the subject, but the matter was left open for further consideration. In New Jersey the Book was rejected. In Pennsylvania and Maryland some amendments were proposed. In South Carolina Bishop White states that it was received without any proposed changes. But the Journal of the South Carolina Convention for 1786 (see Dalcho's Church in South Carolina, p. 471 *et seq.*) shows that Bishop White had been misinformed, and that changes were proposed.* In Virginia it was finally adopted; but great objection was made to the Rubric which still authorized the ministers to reject evil-livers from the Communion. It was evident that the Proposed Book was a failure.

VI.—MODIFICATIONS OF THE PRAYER BOOK IN THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF OCTOBER 10, 1786.

On the reception of the Act of Parliament, which the Archbishops had obtained, the committee summoned the General Convention to meet on the 10th of October. At this meeting it appeared that there was a general desire to comply, as far as possible, with the wishes of the English Prelates; and without debate it was resolved to replace the Nicene Creed

* For this correction of the statement of Bishop White, as it appeared in this Chapter when it was first printed (not published), and for some others, I am indebted to the kindness of Bishop Williams, of Connecticut.

in the Prayer Book, to stand after the Apostles' Creed, with permission to use either. The clause of the descent into hell occasioned much debate; but it was finally restored with the reservation that any Churches may omit the words, or substitute the words, "He went into the place of departed spirits." On some other points, such as the Constitutions of Conventions, and the relation to them of the Bishops and the omission of the Athanasian Creed, the Convention adhered to its former judgment.

VII.—ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PRESENT BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER IN THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF 1789.

In this Convention the Lower House, on the avowed principles of a perfect authority to frame such a Liturgy as they preferred, appointed a committee to prepare a Morning and Evening Prayer, a Litany, and a Communion Service, and other Offices. Their object was to proclaim that there was no obligation imposed upon them to adopt the English offices, further than they were commended to their own judgment as the best.* Bishops White and Seabury, who constituted the

* "The Convention of 1789 appointed a separate Committee to '*prepare* a Morning Service,' to *prepare*—this and that—with no reference whatever to any previous Book in England or America.

"They went on several days preparing several parts and sending them up to the Bishops for consideration. On the 7th day of the Session a deputation from the Lower House inform the Bishops that, 'If they are prepared to *originate* any portions of the Service, the Lower House would receive such *originations*'—and the Bishops then send down certain *alterations originated* in this house, for the action of the Lower House. Now, if any language can be more decisive of a determination to make a book of our own than the words to *prepare* and *originate*, I would be pleased to see them. Hence, while I attach the highest importance to the study of the English Rubrical decisions as containing the principles of Rubrical construction, I do not think that any English Rubric can have any such

Upper House, Bishop Provoost, of New York, absenting himself, took a different view of the case. They regarded the Church in the United States as already in possession of a Liturgy, and considered that they were pledged to the English Bishops to make that the basis of their work, and to discourage all changes but such as were necessary or clearly expedient. In carrying out this principle they were obliged in some points to yield, while in others the Lower House gave way to their suggestions. The Prayer Book thus modified may be justly called that of the *English Church revised and modified.* Yet the changes introduced are numerous, and in some instances very important.

VIII.—CHANGES IN THE PRAYER BOOK.

The members of the Convention seem to have been guided by four leading principles in the changes which they introduced: 1st. That the Revolution made some changes necessary. 2d. That the Services should be shortened. 3d. That some words and phrases which had lost their original meaning should be changed. 4th. That others, which seemed to countenance false doctrine, should be changed or omitted.

1. The first principle required many omissions and alterations. The prayer for the King, with some alterations, became a prayer for the President. In the Litany, a prayer for the Royal family was changed into one for all Christian

connection with our book, as to make its presence or absence of any weight in any matter within the jurisdiction of the American Church." (J. F. Garrison.)

The above statement of Dr. Garrison is enforced by the fact that the language of the House is always to the effect that there is or shall be prepared *a* Litany or *a* Service of any kind, and never that it shall prepare or adopt *the* office, whatever it may be.

rulers and magistrates. In the Articles, the XXIst, on General Councils, was set aside.

2. A second class of alterations consisted of some of those which had been suggested by the Commissioners of King William in 1689.

The *Gloria Patri* was *allowed* to be omitted at the end of each Psalm, and *required* to be used at the end of the Psalter for the day. The *Gloria in Excelsis* was admitted as a substitute. The second Versicle after the Lord's Prayer was omitted. The Lord's Prayer was to be used but once in the Morning and Evening Service. The 100th Psalm was to be used before the *Benedictus*, and only the first four verses of the latter were retained. In the Evening Prayer, the *Magnificat* and the *Nunc Dimittis* were omitted, and the *Cantate Domino* and *Benedic Anima Mea* were substituted for them. Parents were allowed to act as sponsors for their own children. The sign of the cross might be omitted at the request of the sponsors. The Athanasian Creed was omitted; the Commination Service was abolished; the reference to Judas in the exhortation to the Communion was removed. In the Exhortation at the celebration of the Communion, the passage relating to the eating and drinking damnation, and the plaguing with divers diseases and deaths, was also expunged. The Apochryphal Lessons were struck from the table of the Daily Lessons, and allowed only on Saints' Days. All the names of Saints for whom no service was provided were struck from the Calendar. The arrangement for the Sunday Lessons was changed, and a better adaptation of them to special seasons was effected. Lessons from the New Testament were appointed expressly for every Sunday in the year. The petition for victory over enemies in the Prayer for the President was laid aside, together with the words expressive of personal character, such as "most gracious and religious." In the Burial Service, the expression "*dear brother*" was

changed to "deceased brother;" "in the sure and certain hope of the resurrection," was changed to the phrase, "the general resurrection;" and the sentence, "as our hope this our brother doth," was altogether omitted.

3. A third class of alterations was made from the wish to avoid mistakes growing out of the popular associations attached to certain words, and also from the wish to modify the doctrinal meaning of some expressions. The descent into hell, in the Creed, was allowed the alternate, "He went into the place of departed spirits." The word *presbyter* is frequently substituted for the word *priest*. The absolution is called "The declaration of absolution." The absolution in the Visitation for the Sick is struck out; and the Rubric to the effect that the sick man shall be moved to make special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter, was omitted. In the Catechism, the words, *verily and indeed taken and received*, were changed to *spiritually taken and received*. In the first exhortation before the Communion service, the words, *discreet and learned*, as applied to the Minister, are omitted, as well as the subsequent reference to the *benefit of absolution*, etc.

4. A fourth kind of alteration arose from the feelings of delicacy thought to be needlessly disturbed by some expressions which were not offensive to an earlier generation, and are less offensive now to the English than to us. In the *Te Deum*, "Thou didst humble Thyself to be born of a Virgin" was substituted for "Thou didst not abhor the Virgin's Womb." In the eighth petition of the Litany, the expression from "fornication and all other deadly sin" was changed to all "inordinate and sinful affections." For the same reason the marriage service was greatly abridged; and instead of the Churching of women, a short collect was allowed to be used.

5. A fifth class of changes was made for the purpose of

securing grammatical and verbal accuracy. "Our Father *which* art in Heaven" was changed into "*Who* art," etc. "*In* earth" became "*on* earth," "*them that* trespass" was changed to "*those who* trespass," "*rose again*" in the Creed to simply "*rose*."

6. Other changes were made from a desire to shorten the service. The latter part of the Litany, from "Oh! Christ hear us" to "We humbly beseech Thee," was placed in brackets and made discretional. The short absolution of the Communion office was allowed in the Morning and Evening Prayer, as well as the longer one.

7. Another change, which was due to the influence of Bishop Seabury, was the approximation of the Communion office to that of the Scottish Episcopal Church. The oblation and invocation, which were omitted in the Second Book of Edward VI., were restored. But, whereas in the First Book the Invocation preceded the words of Institution, and the oblation followed, in our Book the order is: (1) The Words of Institution. (2) The Oblation. (3) The Invocation.*

* For the following valuable statement I am indebted to the kindness of Bishop Williams.

"In Edward's First Book the Invocation *preceded* the words of Institution, and the Oblation followed them. This was the Roman *disolocation* continued. A Papist could not use the Invocation which spoke of 'creatures of bread and wine,' after the words of Institution which he held wrought the miracle of Transubstantiation. But this arrangement was peculiar to the Litany of St. Peter, and herein it differed from those known as St. John's, St. Mark's, and St. James's, in all of which the order was: 1. Words of Institution; 2. Oblation; 3. Consecration. The order of Edward's First Book, making the Invocation to precede the Words of Institution, was followed in the Scotch Book of 1637. It seems to have been continued in the offices printed in 1724 and 1743; but in the one printed in 1755 the non-Roman order appears: *i. e.* (1) Words of Institution; (2) Oblation; (3) Invocation, so affording a strong protest against Transubstantiation. It was *this* office to which our Prayer

8. Some services entirely new were added, and others added or modified, at a later period. A full notice of such

of Consecration was conformed, and not that of King Edward's First Book. I could never sympathize with those who extolled the arrangement of words of Institution, Oblation, and Invocation in that Book of Edward's. It was discordant with all the Liturgies but one, and far less strong against Romish error."

But while this change of Collocation of the words of Institution, Oblation, and Invocation has all the doctrinal significance and importance which Bishop Williams attaches to it, and which our Church has wisely followed, there were other differences in the later Scotch Prayer Books from the earlier, which our Church has as wisely declined to copy. The most important of these is the following:—

In our Book the Invocation commences thus: "And we most humbly beseech thee, Oh Merciful Father, to hear us; and of thy Almighty goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with thy Word and Holy Spirit these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, *that we receiving them*, according to our Saviour Jesus Christ's most holy institution in remembrance of his death and passion, *may be partakers* of his most blessed body and blood."

Now in the old Scotch Prayer Book of 1637 the corresponding passage agrees, in the doctrinal statement involved, with that of our Book. It is as follows: "Heare us, Oh Merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and of thy Almighty goodnesse vouchsafe to blesse and sanctifie, with thy word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, *that they may be unto us* the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son; so that we receiving them, according to thy Sonne our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, *may be partakers of the same*, his most precious body and blood."

But in the later Scotch Books, when the Collocation of the three constituents of the service was changed, the following important alteration of the language of the old Book of 1637, which we have *not* adopted, was also made. "And we most humbly beseech thee, Oh Merciful Father, to hear us, and of thy Almighty goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with thy word and Holy Spirit these thy creatures of bread and wine, that they *may become* the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son."

When the above change was made, the following passage was omitted: "So that we receiving them, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus

additions and alterations will be made in the Explanation of the Offices and Rubrics which follows this History, and constitutes the Second Part of this Book.

CHAPTER IX.

EXTENT AND LIMITATIONS OF RITUAL LAW AND LIBERTY IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

It has been assumed by some writers, and especially by the late accomplished and learned Bishop Hopkins, of Vermont, that whatever is lawful in the Church of England is equally lawful in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, unless it has been not only excluded and changed, but specifically forbidden. I shall attempt to show in a following chapter that this is an ungrounded assumption. But, inasmuch as it may be regarded by some as a sound principle, it becomes very important to ascertain what is the Ritual law, and what the degree of Ritual liberty in the Church of England; and what, therefore, in conformity with that principle, if it were admitted to be true, would be lawful in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.

It has been shown, in a previous chapter, that the Church of England has been careful, when she specified what services

Christ's most holy institution, may be partakers of the same, his most precious body and blood."

The change from the language of the Book of 1637, and the adoption of that of the first Liturgy of Edward—which latter may be urged in support of an objective presence of Christ's body and blood in the Sacrament—was carefully avoided in our Liturgy. (See Appendix III. of Butler's Book of Common Prayer Interpreted by its History.)

and ceremonies should be observed, to exclude and prohibit all others. It is this fact that I now proceed further to illustrate and confirm. The extent of that prohibition and the authorities upon which it rests may, I think, be fairly expressed in the following statement:—

I. The Acts of Uniformity, the XXXIVth Article, and the Canons distinctly forbid the performance, in the public services of the Church, of any rite, or ceremony, or prayers not expressly appointed and set forth in the Book of Common Prayer.

1. The very fact of prescribing a fixed service involves the prohibition of all others, unless license to do otherwise is explicitly expressed. Every institution must have fixed, and definite, and exclusive regulations. To assert of any organized body, provided with its own constitution, and laws, and franchises, that besides them it possessed many others to be found in preceding institutions, and some of which it had expressly and carefully omitted—not written down, indeed, as part of their liberty or law, but admissible as privileges, or obligatory as duties—would be to state in effect that such an institution had no fixed laws. The regulations of the Church of England, and those alone, are binding and lawful in that communion. However, she may have admitted her obligation to take the Creeds, and Canons, and dogmas of the primitive Church as her guide in the *adoption* of her own regulations; yet when, on these principles, she has established her own formula of faith and worship, and her own Canons of discipline, they alone are law and liberty for her.

2. Besides this necessity, from the very nature of the case, the Church of England has enacted distinct and repeated *prohibitions* of the use of any forms or ceremonies other than those which she has expressly authorized. In the preface to all the Common Prayer Books issued in England by public authority, from the first of Edward VI. to the last under

Charles II., some of the ceremonies previously in use are said to have been "*abolished*" and "*put away.*" The Act of Uniformity authorizing the first book of Edward VI. limits the things to be used to those which are retained *in the said book;* and dwells upon the advantages which ensue upon the "one and uniform rite or order in such Common Prayer, and rites, and external ceremonies." This Act, repealed by Mary, was revived by Queen Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, by which the provisions and penalties of the former Act were re-enacted in reference to the use of the Book of Common Prayer thereby established. It expressly enacts that "all ministers be bounden to say and use the Matins and Even Song, &c., in such order and form as is mentioned in the same book, and *none other or otherwise.*" For the violation of this provision severe penalties were provided by the Act of Elizabeth.

3. By the XIVth Canon of 1604, it is expressly enjoined that "all ministers shall observe the orders, rites, and ceremonies prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer, as well in reading the Holy Scriptures, and saying of prayers, as in administration of Sacraments, without *diminishing*, in regard to preaching or in any other respect, or *adding* anything in the *matter* or *form* thereof. These facts and this language are utterly destructive of the claims made by Bishop Hopkins, and by Advanced Ritualists in England, that "the absence of an express prohibition of a rite or ceremony is a justification of its use." (Bp. Hopkins's Law of Ritualism ; Butler's Ritualism of Law, pp. 50–56.)

4. The Archbishops and Bishops, also, in their "interpretations and further considerations of the Injunctions," issued by Queen Elizabeth (Cardwell, Doc. Ann., vol. 1, pp. 236–8), in 1559, give the following interpretations: "That there be used only but one apparel; as the cope in the administration of the Lord's Supper, and the surplice in all other ministra-

tions; and that there be *no other form and manner* of ministering the Sacraments but as the Service Book doth precisely prescribe, with the declaration of the Injunctions, as, for example, the common bread."

Yet, notwithstanding these very explicit limitations, one class, the most extreme of modern high Ritualists, have contended that all the ceremonies, and rites, and services of the pre-Reformation Uses, which have not been forbidden by name, are still lawful in the Church of England; another class have contended for the lawfulness of the Altar form of the Lord's Table, and the Eastward position in the administration of the Lord's Supper, and of the use of the vestments prescribed by the Rubric of the first Book of Edward VI. and retained at the last revision under Charles II. I will consider each of these claims in the order in which I have named them.

II. By the argument that what is not specifically and expressly forbidden is lawful, and that whatever English usages were not formally interdicted by the Prayer Book of 1549 were virtually enjoined by it, admission would be given to some of the grossest superstitions and the most frivolous ceremonies of the pre-Reformation Church.

Before I consider this argument further, it may be well to notice what are some of the ceremonies and usages, hitherto unknown in the Reformed Church of England, which are claimed by high English Ritualists, and by Bishop Hopkins, to be still lawful and *enjoined* in the Church of England, and in the daughter Church in the United States.

1. By virtue of this principle the following ornaments, vestments, and ceremonies should, according to these authorities, be restored: (1) Processional crosses; (2) Two lights on the Altar; (3) A censer and incense; (4) Altar cross and chancel screen cross; (5) Surplice; (6) Alb; (7) Girdle;

(8) Stole; (9) Dalmatic; (10) Tunicle; (11) Chasuble or Vestment; (12) Cope; (15) Maniple; (16) Hood; (17) Cassock.

2. In the preface to the *Directorium Anglicanum* it is contended that the ancient Canons and Provincial Constitutions have still the force of statute law in so far as they are not contrary to the ordinances of the realm, enacted in the 28th year of Henry VIII. An Act of that year provides that Canons and Constitutions Ecclesiastical, in force up to that period, shall continue in force until it shall appear that they are inconsistent with the Act thus passed. Hence it has been argued that all such Canons and Constitutions are still in force, unless explicitly repealed. A high Ritualistic authority (the *Church Times*, May 4, 1865) announced the astounding proposition, "that the Ritual of the Church of England is in every single particular absolutely identical with that of the period preceding the Reformation, except in those single instances in which the alteration is prescribed in black and white."

3. But so far as this reasoning rests upon the statute of Henry, it is without foundation, for that statute was, by its terms, limited to the period of his life. So far as it rests upon the principle, that all which is not forbidden is allowed, it is contrary to fact; for, as we have seen, the Acts of Uniformity and the Canons which prescribed the Liturgy proscribed everything else. Nor is the statement in itself reasonable—for no law can remain *law* with this interpretation. It could neither be ascertained nor enforced.

4. In the case of *Westerton versus Liddell*, Dr. Lushington thus expressed himself, in delivering his judgment in the Court of Arches: "I take it to be clear that our Church did not adopt by its silence every use and custom of the ancient Church, which it did not expressly prohibit; that it has set forth what it did adopt, though not always in the most perspicacious manner; that what the Church *has prescribed is a*

virtual prohibition of everything else, ejusdum generis—that the maxim *expressio unius est exclusio alterius*, does apply."

And again—quoting and approving a similar statement by the Bishop of Exeter, he says: "In this reasoning of the Right Reverend Prelate I cordially concur. I think he has placed the question on the true ground—what is not permitted is prohibited. All innovations, whether supposed to be derivable from antiquity or otherwise, are violations of the law, and certainly would destroy that uniformity which the very title of the Act shows to be its intention to establish."

5. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council—the ultimate authority on this subject—says: "Their lordships entirely agree with the opinion expressed by the learned judges in these cases (Dr. Lushington and Sir John Dobson of the Court of Arches) and in *Falkner versus Lichfield*, and, in the performance of the services, rites, and ceremonies ordered by the Prayer Book, the directions contained in it *must be strictly observed;* that no omission and no addition can be permitted." They add, however, "that they are not prepared to hold, therefore, that the use of all articles not expressly mentioned in the Rubric, even though quite consistent with and even subsidiary to the service, is forbidden. Organs are not mentioned, yet because they are auxiliary to the singing, they are allowed. Pews, cushions to kneel upon, hassocks, seats by the Communion Table, are in constant use, yet are they not mentioned in any Rubric." So also a side table, because it is directed that at a certain point the minister shall place bread and wine upon the Communion Table.

III. The same result which is aimed at by the two arguments above—viz.: that everything that has been used in the Church of England in pre-Reformation times is still lawful if not expressly forbidden—is also contended for, by what may be called the chronological argument.

It is argued that, inasmuch as the rubric of Elizabeth directed that such ornaments should be retained as were in use by authority of Parliament in the *second year* of King Edward VI.; and the Book did not come into use until the *third* year; and consequently in the second year the Latin Missal and Breviary were the only lawful services in England; it follows that it was the ornaments of the Latin Missal and Breviary that were authorized by the rubric of Elizabeth. The inference, therefore, is that all in the old service books which is not expressly prohibited in the Book of Edward is authorized by this Rubric. That this strange argument is grossly fallacious will appear from the following considerations:—

1. Even if the fact be as stated, yet it is an argument from an evident verbal *mistake* of a single word in a law, against the whole expressed purpose and intention of the law. That intention appears also from the preface of the first Prayer Book, which was also retained in that of Elizabeth, to the effect that, "whereas, heretofore, there hath been great diversity in saying and singing in Churches in this realm . . . now from henceforth, all the whole realm shall have but one use." Nothing could be more explicit than this language to the effect that one only use—that of Edward, as modified by that of Elizabeth—was to be introduced.

2. But, moreover, there is no ground for the representation, that the first book was not adopted until the third year. The book indeed as *printed* could not have come into use until the third year; but the Book as prepared by the authority of Parliament and the King became a law of the land in the second year. This very point was considered by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of Westerton *versus* Liddell, March 31, 1867. They say, that "there seems no reason to doubt that the Act in question received the Royal assent in the second year of Edward VI. It concerned an

Act of great urgency which had been long under consideration and was the first Act of the session; it passed through one house of Parliament on January 15, 1549, and in the other on the 21st of the same month; and the second year of Edward VI. did not expire until January 28th. In the Act of 5th and 6th of Edward VI. (chapt. 1, § 5), it is expressly referred to as the Act made in the second year of the King's Majesty's reign. Upon this point, therefore, no difficulty can arise. It is very true that the new Prayer Book could not *come into use* until after the expiration of that year; because time must be allowed for printing and distributing the books; but its use and the injunctions contained in it were established by the authority of Parliament in the second year of Edward VI.; and *this is the plain meaning of the rubric.*" (Moore's Report of Westerton *versus* Liddell, Contemporary Review, Vol. 1, pp. 16, 17.)

From the same ultimate court of appeal we learn that the settled legal rule at the time of this enactment was, that, "when the commencement of an Act was not directed to be from any particular time, it took effect from the first day of the session in which the Act was passed."

IV. Ceremonies and ornaments claimed as lawful under cover of the arguments above considered:—

1. *Altar lights.*—There is no authority for Altar lights in the first book of Edward nor in the subsequent books. It is true that in the Injunctions issued by Edward on his accession, before the Liturgy was framed, there was a direction that no candles or torches nor tapers should be set before images or pictures, but only two lights upon the high Altar, before the Sacrament, which, for the signification that Christ is the true light of the world, they should suffer to remain. This direction, although it was not repeated in the first Prayer Book, has been claimed as still virtually sanctioned by the decision in the "Knightsbridge" case. But in that

case the decision was that two lights upon the altar, which might be needed at some time to give light, and which only in such cases should be lighted, need not be removed. It did not countenance Altar lights—candles burning—*in honorem Sacramenti*. Some Articles which came forth from the King in Council prescribed, that in reading the King's former Injunctions there shall be an omission of all such as make mention of Popish Masses, of chauntries, *of candles upon altars*, or any such like thing. They are then not only without any sanction in the Prayer Book, but the only injunction in which they are authorized is expressly revoked.

It is true that they were pronounced lawful in the case of Martin against Mr. Mackonochie, by Sir Robert Phillimore as Dean of the Court of Arches. (Eccl. Judgments of Sir R. Phillimore, p. 116.) But this decision has been reversed by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The Ritual Commission also expressed its conviction of their unlawfulness in its second report in 1868, in the following terms: (4) "The use of lighted candles at the celebration of the Holy Communion has been introduced into certain Churches within a period of the last twenty-five years. It is true there have been candlesticks with candles on the Lord's Table during a long period in many Cathedral Churches and chapels, and also in the Chapels of some colleges and of some Royal and Episcopal residences; but the instances that have been adduced to prove that candles have been lighted, as accessories to the Holy Communion, are few and much contested. (5) With regard to parish Churches, whatever evidence there may be as to candlesticks, with candles, being upon the Lord's Table, no sufficient evidence has been adduced to prove before us that at any time, during the last three centuries, lighted candles have been used in any of these Churches as accessories to the celebration of the Holy Communion, until with-

in about the last twenty-five years." (Hope's Worship of the Church of England, p. 225.)

2. *Incense.*—As in the case of lights upon the Altar, so in that of incense, a few scattered instances of its use by eminent divines have been pointed out by Mr. Hope (Worship, &c., pp. 242–3), but it has been clearly prohibited, first by the general law that "what the Church has prescribed is a virtual prohibition of everything else *ejusdam generis*"—and again by the express decision of Sir Robert Phillimore, in the case of Mr. Mackonochie. (Judgments, p. 118.) It is not pretended that its use has ever been authorized, even by Royal Injunctions, as in the case of lights upon the Altar; but its lawfulness has been vindicated by the chronological argument, the fallacy of which has already been exposed.

3. *The elevation of the cup and paten.*—This has been decided, in the cases of Mackonochie and Simpson, by Sir R. Phillimore, to be unlawful, in the following words: "It is not lawful to elevate the cup and paten during the celebration of the Holy Communion, in a greater degree than is necessary to comply with the Rubric." (Judgments, p. 7.) The practice condemned was, in the case of Mr. Mackonochie, that of elevating the paten and the cup "in a greater degree than by merely taking the same into his hands as prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer;" and in the case of Mr. Simpson, "after the prayer of consecration," of having "raised the paten with both hands over his head and the cup in like manner." In the case of Mr. Mackonochie, it was also proved, and condemnation was also pronounced against the proceedings, "that after the consecration of both the bread and wine, he elevated the paten and the cup respectively for an appreciable time."

4. *Wafer bread.*—The Western Church, as a natural outgrowth of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, was very strenuous for the use of unleavened bread in the form of wafer

cakes, in order that there might be less danger of the profanation of the body of the Lord, through the loss of crumbs; while the Eastern Church as tenaciously advocated the use of leavened bread. At the commencement of the Reformation there is no doubt that round and unleavened wafer cakes were used. A Rubric in the First Book directs that wafer-bread shall be so fashioned that "it may be aptly divided into divers pieces." But in the Second Book the Rubric was changed, and for the purpose of taking away "all occasion of dissension or superstition," "it should suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten." By the term "it shall suffice," it was understood, not that wafer was prohibited, but that common, pure wheaten bread, leavened, was allowed; and accordingly Queen Elizabeth in one of her Injunctions specified the form in which the wafer-bread should be made. The use of the wafer by Mr. Purchas was pronounced lawful by Sir Robert Phillimore (Judgments, p. 190), but that judgment has been reversed by the Judicial Committee. The use of the wafer better harmonizes with the view which locates the body of Christ in the consecrated bread; and that of common bread, such "as is usual to be eaten," with the view of the Lord's Supper as a commemorative feast.

5. *Water mixed with wine.*—The rubric of 1549 orders that water shall be mixed with wine; but this rubric has been ever since omitted. Dr. Phillimore decided in the case of Mackonochie "that the ceremony or manual act of mixing water with the wine *during the celebration* of the Eucharist was illegal"; but that "it was not illegal to administer to the communicants wine in which a little water had been previously mixed." He also gave a similar decision in the case of Mr. Purchas. (Judgments, p. 187.) But these decisions were reversed by the Judicial Committee, and the mixture of the water with wine was declared illegal.

6. *Other ornaments and ceremonies and customs—Credence tables.*—Small side tables, on which the bread and wine are placed before the consecration, were condemned in the case of Liddell, but were declared not only lawful by the Privy Council, but needful to carry out the Rubric which directs the minister to place the bread and wine on the Communion Table at the time of the celebration.

Immovable stone altars have been condemned in the Court of Arches, in more instances than one; and no appeal from these decisions has been made.

Altar cloths, of various colors and construction to symbolize the different Church seasons, were condemned in the Arches Court by Dr. Lushington and Sir John Dobson, but the Privy Council overruled the decision.

The cross attached to the Communion Table has been prohibited; but a movable cross, as one of the ornaments of worship, "placed in another part of a Church or Chapel," "not in any sense upon the Table," "nor in any sense in communication or connection or contact with it," has been pronounced by the Privy Council lawful and unobjectionable.

Thus we see, from this full review, that the Church of England has not been so careless or unskilful as to leave an opening in the wall by which she endeavored to shut out superstitions and objectionable practices, by which they might all again enter and occupy the same position as of old; but that she has specifically excluded, by the decision of her highest courts, many of the practices and ceremonies introduced by modern Ritualists, and which some of them continue to uphold and use, in defiance of law, and of that exposition of law which the practice of three hundred years has furnished. The only newly introduced or re-introduced customs which have not been condemned in the Ecclesiastical Courts, are the harmless or unobjectionable ones of "the

credence table," "altar cloths," and "the cross" when not attached to or in contact with the Communion Table.

The question of the Eastern position and of vestments will be considered in the next chapter.

CHAPTER X.

POSITION OF THE COMMUNION TABLE; THE POSITION OF THE CELEBRANT; AND THE VESTMENTS TO BE WORN.

I PROCEED, in this chapter, to consider the three topics enumerated in its title, with a strong feeling of the difficulty of treating them satisfactorily in so short a space.

I.—POSITION OF THE COMMUNION TABLE.

The Rubric at the beginning of the Communion Office recognizes two positions of the Table as alike lawful. It may stand in the body of the Church—or in the chancel. "In the former case it would stand long-wise, *i. e.* parallel to the north and south walls of the Church." (Bishop of Lincoln, quoted by Hope, Worship, &c., p. 192.) When it stood in the chancel, it was to remain, with a covering, at its east end, except when the Communion was administered; upon which occasions it was to be brought forward. Such was the purport of an Injunction issued by Queen Elizabeth soon after the Prayer Book was published. (How shall we Conform? &c., Robertson, p. 152.) It was also ordered by Canon LXXXII. of 1604, that, upon occasion of administration of the Communion, the Table "shall be placed in so good sort within the Church or chancel as thereby the minister may be more conveniently heard of the communicants in his prayer

and ministration." By the fact that it was not to be *fixed* at the east end, but was to be brought forward, it is clear that the Table was not regarded, nor used in the administration as an altar. And this conclusion is equally valid, whether it be proved that the Table in the chancel stood "long-wise," *i. e.*, with its longer sides parallel with the north and south side of the Church, or whether it stood cross-wise, with its shorter sides opposite to the north and south walls of the Church. For it is the fact of its being detached and brought forward, and used thus as a movable Table, which makes it impossible that it should be regarded as an altar.

The custom, in this respect, seems to have varied. (Robertson, pp. 155–161.) Dean Howson contends that the *usual* position of the table in the chancel up to 1661 was *long-wise;* and he quotes the admission of advocates of the Eastward position to that effect. (Before the Table, Dean Howson, p. 37.) He writes that: "A definite attempt was made in 1661 to cause the Communion Tables to be placed altar-wise against the eastern walls of our Churches; and that this attempt was decisively foiled and defeated under the combined action of Parliament and Convocation. That a Canon and Rubric explicitly declared against such a position 'at the Communion time' is certain. It is certain also that this Canon and Rubric were deliberately left unchanged. But it is certain likewise that the placing of the Lord's Table altar-wise at the east wall did gradually become the *custom* of the Church of England." The Dean, however, proceeds to give evidence of the preceding custom, accordant with the Rubric and the Canon, having survived in several parishes, and constituting a proof of its former general observance. (Before the Table, pp. 40–45.)

II.—THE EASTERN POSITION.

The question of the position to be assumed at the prayer of Consecration is regarded in England, alike by those who advocate and those who oppose the Eastern position, as one of very great moment. The vehemence with which it has been advocated and opposed can be explained only on the supposition that it is believed to have a very important doctrinal significance. But its advocates do not contend that the consecration would be any the less real, or the blessings which its administration bestows upon the Communicants would be less, if they should utter the prayer of consecration and consecrate at the north side of the table. But they regard it —(1) As a time-honored custom; (2) They advocate it on the ground of orientation: (3) Mr. Beresford Hope makes much of the poetical analogy of an Eastern shepherd leading his sheep, or of one presenting a petition to his sovereign on behalf of those who stand behind him: (4) They regard the act as a solemn priestly one, which it is more becoming and reverent to perform in an attitude which expresses the fact that it is done *for*, and in no sense *by* the people, and alone with God: (5) Some, like the late Archdeacon Freeman, have based its supreme importance on the belief that by the position facing Eastward "is signified and expressed the solemn oblation and sacrificial presentation made by the celebrant after the example of Christ" (Before the Table, Howson, p. 99); (6) They evade the decisions of the Courts against it by contending that the north side upon which it is decreed that they should stand and consecrate, meant the northernmost portion of the west side; while Mr. Beresford Hope has committed himself to the truly Hibernian proposition, "that the north side became the west one as soon as the table was turned round and put altar-wise"! (Worship of Church of England, pp. 170, 171.)

In reply to these allegations, and in reference to this custom, the following statements may be made:—

1. The fact that it has become a *custom*, no doubt in large part, from the inconvenience of removing the Table from the east wall forward, to celebrate with the Table remaining stationary against the East wall, or against a *reredos*, does not transform the Table into an altar, nor warrant any change in the attitude to be maintained, because the Rubrics have remained unaltered.

2. This custom, which has been regarded as "time honored," was unknown in the Reformed Church of England, previous to the year 1662; and the Rubric upon which it is based was not inserted until that year. Dean Howson shows conclusively (Chap. IX.) that it was not practised by those most eminent representatives of the School of High Anglican divines, who would be more likely to adopt it than any others —Bishops Wren, Laud, Cosin, and Wilson. Mr. Beresford Hope admits that both Wren and Laud declared upon their trial that they had not consecrated from the Eastern position, or that, if they had done so, it was by accident or for convenience; but this declaration, he says, was made in peril of their lives, and hence they gave only a part of the truth in their reply. Says Dean Howson, "Such an apology, made in behalf of these men for such an action, when great principles were at stake, shocks the moral sense."

Nor has this practice prevailed generally or largely, but only in a few sporadic and exceptional cases, since the Rubric upon which it is vindicated was introduced in 1662. Bishop Wordsworth asserts that in the Cathedrals of England, until very recently, "there has been an absolute agreement of practice, condemnatory of the Eastern position." Even the Non-Jurors, in their Prayer Book of 1718, while they call the Table an altar, and direct it to be *fixed* at the east end, yet by Rubric enjoin the northern position: "Note that

whenever in this office the Priest is directed to turn to the altar, or to stand or kneel before it, or with his face towards it, it is always meant *that he should always kneel on the north side thereof.*" (Howson, p. 91.) It appears, therefore, that the Eastern position is not recommended by long or frequent use in the Church of England.

3. The poetical argument from Orientation and the Eastern shepherd, and the petitioner to a King, cannot be regarded as of much weight. Orientation has received no direct sanction in the Church of England. If the priest be likened to a shepherd in this office, he would be better represented as feeding than leading them; and in that case he would stand facing them. If we go into poetical analogies for argument on this question, we could find them for any position which we might prefer should be assumed.

4. The doctrinal reasons for this practice, given above (4) (5), are, of course, just those which constitute a reason for resisting it on the part of those by whom it is disapproved. To consider them at length would be to leave the subject in hand—Liturgies—for controversial divinity.

5. The Rubrical directions which determine this question are the Fourth Rubric prefaced to the Communion Office, and that which immediately precedes the prayer of Consecration. The former is as follows: "The Table, at Communion time, having a fair white linen cloth upon it, shall stand in the body of the Church, where Morning and Evening Prayer are appointed to be said. *And the priest, standing on the north side of the table, shall say the Lord's Prayer, the people kneeling.*" It is this last direction, viz., that the priest shall stand at the north side of the table when he says the prayer following, that I will now consider.

Several evasions of this plain Rubric have been devised, but none of them have much plausibility. It has, for three hundred years, been interpreted to mean that the position of

the celebrant should be at the north of the Table, whether it stood lengthwise or crosswise, whether in the body of the Church or in the chancel. We have seen the extraordinary argument of Mr. Hope, and the scarcely less strange explanation that by the north side is meant, not the end of the Table, but the intervening space between the middle of the Table and the north corner. But in that case the Table would have two north sides, the eastern as well as the western. Mr. A. S. Stephens, in his reply to this statement, remarks "that no *form* of the Table has been prescribed. It may legally be circular. In that case there can be no *side*, in the sense here contended for." Hence, he concludes that the meaning of the north side "seems really to be simply to the north of the Table." The Scotch Prayer Book, revised by Laud, has "*north side or end.*" Bishop Wren, another of its revisers, and, like Laud, accused of Romanizing tendencies, contended that "north part, north side, north end, were all one." L'Estrange, in his "Alliance of Divine Offices," written during the last revision of the Prayer Book, writes, "that as for the priest standing at the north side of the Table, this seemeth to avoid the fashion of the priest standing with his face towards the East, as is the Popish practice."

But that which is chiefly relied upon for the Eastward position is the Rubric which immediately precedes the Prayer of Consecration. "When the priest *standing before the table* hath so ordered the bread and wine that he may, with the more readiness and decency, *break the same before the people* and take the cup in his hands, he shall say," &c.

It is to be remembered that, until the last revision, there was no provision for "breaking the bread," and that this Rubric was introduced to remedy that obvious defect. It is well remarked by Dean Howson, that "whatever be meant by standing before the Table is to be made subservient to

the great end of breaking the bread openly in the sight of the congregation" (p. 63).

The evident design of the Rubric is that the elements shall be so arranged that the breaking of the bread and the filling of the cup shall be in the sight of the people. It designates the place at which the celebrant shall stand *to order the elements*, but not that at which he shall break the bread and fill the cup, and say the prayers. *That* has been designated by the Fourth Rubric, which specifies the north side of the Table at which the whole service shall be performed. "The language of the Rubric is very clear. According to the rules of grammar, the participle *standing* must refer to the word *ordered*, and not to *say;* so that the priest must *order* standing before, &c., and not *say* standing before, &c. On comparing the Rubrics, it will also be observed that the priest is to order the bread and wine so that he may more readily have access to them; and *after that*, standing at the north side of the Table, he is to break the bread before the people." (Stephen's Pr. Bk., p. 1193.) Moreover, if the priest is to stand before the table during the Prayer of Consecration, there is no necessity of *ordering the bread* and *wine anew*, so as to enable him to reach it; whereas, if he is to stand at the north end, he must place the elements near him, in order that he may reach and consecrate them. (Goode, Ceremonial of Church of England, p. 19.) The same exposition of this Rubric is given by the most eminent earlier Ritual authorities—Wheatley, Bp. Mant, Dr. Nichols, and Archdeacon Yardley—as well as by those of highest authority in more recent times — Professor Blunt, Proctor, Blakenly, and Bardsley.

6. And the decision of the highest Ecclesiastical authority, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, is to the same effect. In the cases of Mr. Purchas and Mr. Mackonochie, the decision of the Arches Court *sanctioned* the Eastward

position; but this judgment was set aside by the Judicial Committee, whose decision closes with these words: "They think that the Prayer of Consecration is to be used at the north side of the table, so that the minister looks south, whether a broader or narrower side of the table be towards the north."

Thus it is seen that the Eastern position is a custom recently introduced; that it has received no sanction from the most eminent Bishops and Ritual authorities in the Church of England; and that it has been condemned as illegal by the highest Judicial authority in the Kingdom. To practise it now is to violate clearly expressed law.

III.—VESTMENTS.

It was seen (Chap. IV.) that the Rubric which restored the ornaments in use in the second year of Edward VI. was virtually abolished by the Advertisements issued in the Queen's name, in 1565, by Archbishop Parker. It was there shown that those Advertisements had the force of law, and that, though the Rubric was not removed, it was no longer operative, having been superseded by those Advertisements. If this state of things continued, then, according to this argument, the Rubric still remained as before, without force.

This state of things *did* continue. The Canons of 1604 (XXIV., XXV., LVIII.) confirm the Advertisements of 1565, and direct that the reading of the service and ministering of the Sacraments shall be "by ministers in surplices and therewithall hoods, if they be graduates." But in 1662, at the final revision of the Prayer Book, the Rubric directing the use of the ornaments of the First Book of Edward VI., was still retained. And now the question is: "Did this retention of the Rubric nullify the Advertisements of 1565 and the Canons of 1604? Or did the Rubric, as before, remain nullified

by them? Was it left there in its former powerlessness? Or did its continued presence there revive its life, and render it henceforth operative and lawful or obligatory in the Church of England?"

1. If the Rubric was powerless and nullified by other enactments, although it was left standing in the Prayer Book during the reigns of Elizabeth, and James I., and Charles I., we see not why it was not also the case when it was left standing in the Book of Charles II.

2. The interpretation and the practice *after* the revision of 1662, was precisely the same as before. It was not claimed that the use of the vestments of the second year of Edward VI. (notwithstanding the continued presence of the Rubric), was restored by the revised Book of 1662. No attempt was made then, nor for nearly two hundred years afterwards, to introduce them, or to prove their lawfulness or obligation.

3. If it had been the purpose to restore it as an operative Rubric, it would have been necessary to change the three Canons to which it stands in direct contradiction. But those Canons remained unchanged, and were brought to bear in the way of penalty and discipline against those who violated their provisions.

4. If this course of argument be correct, then the only vestments which are lawful in the Church of England are—in parish Churches the *surplice* in the Service and Communion; in Cathedrals and Collegiate Churches *copes* in the administration of the Communion, and *surplices* in all other services. But while the law directs the use of the cope in Cathedrals, its use can be found by the most diligent inquirers to have been maintained in only a very few instances.

5. But even if the Rubric be allowed to be still in force, it is, as we have stated, in direct contradiction to three existing Canons, re-enacted at the same time with the re-insertion of the Rubric; and if therefore it be a case of conflicting laws,

it is evident that those whose validity has never been questioned, and which have been enforced for three hundred years, are those which should be regarded as present law as against that which has been repeatedly declared abrogated, and of no obligation, and has been claimed as law or liberty for only the last twenty or thirty years.

6. But, moreover, the unlawfulness of the use of the vestments enumerated in the Rubric, in every case in which the question has been carried to the highest court of appeal, has been emphatically declared. In the cases of Mr. Mackonochie and of Mr. Ridsdale, the latter called the Folkstone Ritual case, the first one tried under the recent Public Worship Regulation Act—the decision was against the lawfulness of the vestments. It is true that Sir Robert Phillimore has pronounced them lawful in the Court of Arches, and that some clergymen in the Church of England, in the exercise of their private judgment, deny the justice and validity of the decision of the higher court, and have continued the practice which has been condemned, and against which penalties have been pronounced and executed. Many of the decisions of Sir Robert Phillimore, in the Court of Arches, on questions of high Ritual, have been contrary to those of his predecessors, and have been reversed by the Judicial Committee. He has elaborately vindicated most of the recently introduced customs of the extreme Ritualists, and his great learning and his ingenious argumentation have done much to confirm those who make it a matter of conscience to violate the laws of the Church by whose emoluments they are supported, to continue in the open defiance of the solemn and reiterated judgments of the highest ecclesiastical and civil tribunals of the country. Judge Phillimore has pronounced in favor of the Eastern position, of kneeling at the prayer of consecration, of two lights upon the Table during the celebration of the Communion, of the vestments prescribed by the Rubric of the First

Book of Edward, of the mixture of water with the wine, and of wafer bread; and all these judgments have been reversed.

7. Why, then, if the "Ornaments Rubric" has been nullified by the Advertisements, and has not been claimed as law or liberty, until within the last few years, was it still retained in the Prayer Book of Charles II.? I am unable to answer that question. I can see a reason for its retention during the reign of Elizabeth in her personal preference and her strong will; but I can no more see a reason why it should have been inserted in the review of 1604, under James I., than why it should have again appeared under Charles II. Two answers have been given to this question, one by those who regard the rubric as still in force, and the other by the court that has pronounced against it.

(1) It has been claimed that the Canons are intended to specify the *minimum* of Ritual which will be allowed, and that the rubric is left to mark the *maximum*. The theory has no plausibility, for there is no intimation in the one or the other of such intention—the two are not complementary but contradictory—not optional but mandatory, and there is no example in the Prayer Book or the Canons of such an arrangement. Where there is a permission or direction for the use of more or less, it is given in clear directions which cannot be misunderstood. For instance in the Baptismal Service it is directed that the whole of it shall be used at least once in every month (if there be a Baptism) and upon intermediate occasions a specified portion may be omitted.

Bishop Wordsworth has adopted the interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric, that previous to the last revision it was *ordered*, and that since then it has been *permitted*, that the vestments should be used. His argument is based upon the assumption that the Rubric is mandatory up to the period of the last revision, and so far modified at the revision as to be thereafter permissive. The language of the Rubric in the

Prayer Book of Elizabeth and James and Charles was, that the "*Ministers shall use* such ornaments," etc. In the rubric of the revised Book the language is, "such ornaments, etc., shall *be retained* and be *in use*," etc. It is difficult to see any difference in the mandatory import of these two forms of the Rubric. That the Ministers *shall use*, and that the Ornaments *shall be in use*, are in their import equivalent expressions. They are so regarded by the Judicial Committee in the Folkstone case. Bishop Wordsworth adduces as an authority in support of this view, the position and testimony of Bishop Cosin. "Bishop Cosin," he writes, "when writing on the Ornaments Rubric before 1660, had *affirmed* the vestments to be prescribed by law, but after the Restoration, after he became Bishop of Durham, he never *required* the use of these vestments by any of his clergy, nor has any of the Bishops since the Restoration (more than 400 in number) *prescribed* them." Before the Restoration he affirmed that they were *prescribed*, but he afterwards found, what he did not seem to know when he wrote that they were prescribed, that they were nullified by the advertisements of 1566, and *that was the reason* why they were not prescribed by him, or by any one of the 400 Bishops since the Restoration.

In one of his notes to the Prayer Book he had affirmed that the clergy were "all still bound to wear albs and vestments howsoever it was neglected, and that the XIVth and LVIIIth Canon of 1603–4 were inconsistent with each other." "But," say the Judicial Committee in the Folkstone case, "perceiving some time afterwards (at what time is uncertain) that he had in that note overlooked the terms of the statute (1 Eliz. Cap. 2, Sec. 25) he added, 'But the Act of Parliament, *I see*, refers to the Canon, and *until such time* as other order shall be taken.'"

"In another passage of the same set of notes (Ibid. p. 990) he had distinctly recognized the authority of those Articles

of Advertisement which relate to this matter, as a due exercise of the powers given to the Crown by that statute." He had also as Archdeacon and as Bishop enforced the provisions of the Canons. (The Folkstone Ritual Case, Official Report, pp. 732–35. Bishop Wordsworth's charge, London Guardian, Dec. 1879.)

These facts directly confute the arguments of Bishop Wordsworth, and nullify the authority, *quoad hoc*, of Bishop Cosin.

"The result," say the Judicial Committee, "appears to be that the opinions recorded in the private notes of this divine at different periods of his life are not consistent with each other, while those of them which are adverse to the validity of the Advertisements are inconsistent with his official acts done in the exercise of a legal jurisdiction, and in the discharge of his public duty both before and afterwards" (p. 735).

(2) A more authoritative reason for the retention of the Rubric is given by the Lord Chancellor in the Folkstone case. He says, speaking in the name of the Judicial Committee: "Their Lordships cannot look upon this Rubric as being otherwise than what it was before, *a memorandum or note of reference to the law* (*i.e.*, the law of Parliament of 1st Eliz., chap. ii.)." And again: "The Rubric served, as it had long previously served, as a *note* to remind the Church that the *general standard of ornaments* both of the Church and the ministers, was to be that established by the authority of the Parliament in 1549: but that this standard was set up under a law, still unrepealed, which engrafted on the standard a qualification that, as to the vesture of parish ministers, the surplice, and not the vestment or tunicle, should be used." Divested of their technical legal phraseology, I understand these sentences to mean that the Parliaments of Edward and Elizabeth enacted a law concerning ornaments, a portion of which has been modified, while the law itself has not been

repealed, and that therefore the original form of the law is still inserted in the Prayer Book as a *note* or *memorandum of its general purport*, while the "qualification engrafted upon it" is expressed in other rubrics and in the Canons.*

The point here rather vaguely stated may be more clearly apprehended from two other sentences from the same judgment, the purport of which is that the so-called Ornaments Rubric, retained in the Prayer Book of Charles II., is not a *Rubric at all, but only a reference to a Rubric.* "It is clear that through this long period (1566–1662) the Ornaments Rubric, as originally printed in the Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth, was allowed to remain unaltered. This, then, being the state of the law up to, and in, 1662, and the Ornaments Rubric up to, and in, that time, not being in any sense a complete and independent enactment, but being merely a reference to an external law, viz., the statute of the 1st of Elizabeth (1 Eliz., Cap. 2, § 25, which gave statutory power

* The following statement of Dr. Stephens, in the argument for the respondent in the Folkstone Ritual Case (p. 395), gives a new and perhaps fanciful reason why the rubric was retained by the Act of Uniformity, and of the extent of its operation. "This proviso, retaining the Ornaments of the Minister which were in use in the 2d year of Edward VI., must be taken as applying exclusively to the Ornaments which were not inconsistent with the policy and the leading principles of the new service prescribed by the Act of Uniformity of 1559. In other words, while the sacrificial vestments were destroyed (viz., the chasuble, the alb, and the tunicle), with all the other adjuncts of the superstitious service, the non-sacrificial vestments were retained, consequently a power was given to the Queen by which she could retain or discontinue all or any of the non-sacrificial vestures. The Queen, therefore, had a power to restore the cope and the hood, which had been omitted from the book of 1552. It required no express words in Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity to prohibit the use of the sacrificial vestures which symbolized or were adjuncts of the Roman Catholic or superstitious service—on the principle that where the subject is destroyed the adjunct drops of course.

to the Injunctions issued by the Crown), the question now to be asked is, was it the intention, and was it the effect of the alteration of the Ornaments Rubric in 1662 to repeal the 25th section of the Statute of Elizabeth, and all that had been done under it, and to set up a new and self-contained law on the subject of Ritual?" (Folkstone Ritual Case, p. 719.)

The Judicial Committee then proceed to answer this question in the negative.

Again, the Committee say: "It is to be borne in mind that the Ornaments Rubric, which it is now contended contains the whole enactment or law relating to the vesture of the clergy, was not meant to be an enactment at all, and it in fact ended with a reference to the statute 1st Eliz. Chap. 2, set out in the beginning of the Prayer Book, in terms which show that the Rubric claimed no intrinsic authority for itself" (p. 707).

8. Whether or no these explanations are felt to be satisfactory, there can be no doubt that the opinion of the Church authorities was the same *after* the review of 1662 as before. The Lord Chancellor proceeds to state that, "during the twenty-five years immediately succeeding the legislation of 1662, we have a series of Visitation Articles (those of fifteen Bishops and one Archbishop, and of thirteen Dioceses), which prove conclusively that those whose official duty it was to see the law observed, and of whose strictness in the performance of that duty the same Articles supply abundant evidence, understood the law still to be that the surplice was always to be used by the clergy in the administration of the Holy Communion. (Report of Folkstone Ritual Case, London *Times*, March 13th, 1877.)

From the preceding chapter and the present, we see, therefore, that none of the pre-Reformation customs, which have not been sanctioned by the Prayer Book, are lawful in the Church

of England; and that by the decision of its highest courts, the vestments of the 1st Book of Edward VI., together with the Eastern position, the undue elevation of the cup and paten, the two lights upon the Communion Table, the mixed cup, wafer bread and incense, and other ceremonies adopted by modern Ritualists have been condemned as illegal [see the 10th count in the indictment of Purchas, condemned by Sir R. Phillimore].

If, therefore, it should be found true that all that is lawful in the Church of England is equally lawful in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, it is also found, by that principle, that none of the ornaments and ceremonies enumerated above are lawful in our Church. In my next chapter I shall show that there is no ground for this assertion.

CHAPTER XI.

LITURGICAL LAW AND LIBERTY IN THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES.

In the opposition to the position that whatever is lawful in the Church of England is equally lawful in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, I assume and sustain the following propositions:—

I.—OUR PRAYER BOOK, REVISED AND AMENDED, AFTER THAT OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, EMBODIES OUR FAITH AND PRESCRIBES OUR PRACTICE; AND ONLY SUCH SERVICES AND CEREMONIES AS IT APPOINTS AND AUTHORIZES ARE OBLIGATORY OR LAWFUL IN OUR CHURCH.

In the Eighth chapter an account was given of the changes made in the English Prayer Book, and of the enactment of

the Book thus amended by the General Convention. The Prayer Book has Constitutional authority, for it is incorporated into the Constitution (Article VIII.), and is capable of alteration or addition only in the same way as the other Articles of the Constitution. That the Constitution thus established permits only what it prescribes, appears from the following considerations :—

1. From the very nature of laws and regulations, which *proprio vigore* exclude what they do not prescribe. This canon of reason is repeatedly stated as a principle of law, by the highest Ecclesiastical courts in England. This is not law for us because it is law for England ; but it is an essentially involved principle underlying our law as it does theirs. What the Reformed Church of England *adopted* from the Pre-Reformation Uses and usages was its obligation. What it omitted was not its liberty. In like manner what we have adopted, either from antiquity or the Liturgy of the Church of England, is our obligation, and what we have omitted in adopting the English Book is not our liberty.

2. The same thing appears from the history of our successful attempt to obtain the Episcopacy from England. The English Archbishops and Bishops did not feel at liberty to aid in giving complete organization to our Church, by consecrating Bishops for it, because it proposed to omit the Athanasian and Nicene Creeds, and did not give an absolute veto to the Bishops in their Conventions. This incident proves that it was the understanding of both parties that *not everything* that was lawful or obligatory in the Church of England would be equally so in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States.

3. The Constitution and Canons of the Church prescribe the use of the Liturgy thus established, and prohibit the use of any other services than those which it has provided. The Constitution (Article VIII.) provides that the established

Book of Common Prayer shall be used in the Dioceses which shall have adopted the Constitution. Canon XXII., title 1, enacts that "every minister shall, before all sermons and lectures, and all other occasions of public worship, use the Book of Common Prayer as the same is or may be established by the General Convention of the Church; and in performing such services no other prayers shall be used than those prescribed by the same Book."

4. In opposition to the principle here adopted, it has been contended by the late Learned Judge Hoffman (Treatise on the Law of the Prot. Epis. Church), that our Church is "identical with the Church of England," and that "the whole compact body of the English Church in all its integrity, as far, and in every particular as far, as it was not necessarily or by express enactment changed, was continued and perpetuated" (p. 38).

That this is not the position practically recognized and held by our Church, and that a transparent fallacy is involved in the statement, will appear from several considerations:—

(1) If our Church had recognized this principle—if she is indeed "*identical* with the Church of England"—if "the whole compact body of the English Church" (a vague and scarcely intelligible statement, by which I suppose is meant the whole compact body of the English regulations) "in all its integrity," unless expressly changed, "was continued and perpetuated," then all that has since been enacted as law for the Church of England would be law for us. In that case the new Lectionary of the Church of England would not have needed to be allowed by our General Convention, but would have been obligatory without our allowance; and the American Bishops at the late Lambeth Conference would not have declined to take part in discussions upon measures relating exclusively to the English Church; or to concur in measures which would put under the direction and decision

of the Archbishop of Canterbury any matters in question in our Church.

(2) The position assumed by Dr. Hoffman involves the following contradictory and self-annihilating proposition: Because our Church declared her purpose "not to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, and worship, or farther than local circumstances require," when she organized herself into an independent National Church; therefore, after, on that principle, she had organized an independent National Church, she still remained identical with the Church of England, and dependent upon it, and bound by all its laws and regulations, except those which she has explicitly repealed! There is no exaggeration in this statement; for Dr. Hoffman admits that we did become a National Church.

(3) Nor do the authorities which he adduces, to show that we are still under all English Ecclesiastical law which has not been repealed, sustain that position. Dr. Hawks is quoted in support of that position, but his language in the quotation—as well as his more distinct declarations elsewhere—imply the very opposite. He states "that, though the independence of the United States *dissolved the connection* (between England and the United States), it evidently did not destroy *the prevailing opinions* among Churchmen, as to matters and usages touching the Church. To the common and canon law of England, we must look, therefore, if we would *understand the origin* of much of the law of our own Church." We are to find in that law the *origin* of much of our own, not the *binding force* of that which is *not our own.*

The General Convention of 1814, with a view to prove the Church's right to inherit property belonging to the Church of England in the Colonies before the Revolution, declared that the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States was *the same body* heretofore known in these States by the name

of the Church of England." Nothing more *could have been meant* by these words, than that those who before the Revolution were members of the Church of England had continued in the worship and faith and discipline of that body, with certain modifications, when they organized themselves, after the Revolution, into a new body, called by a new name. For neither by any practical action, nor by any declaration up to this period, did the Church of England assert, or the Church in the United States admit the identity of the two bodies. Nothing *more could have been intended*, for the same paragraph in which this assertion is made closes with this declaration: "But it would be contrary to fact for any one to infer that the discipline exercised in this Church, or that any proceedings therein *are at all dependent* upon the civil or ecclesiastical authority of any other country." This declaration certainly could not have been made if our Church was the "same body" as the Church of England, in any other than the sense I have indicated.

The principle upon which our Church proceeded is well expressed in what Dr. Hoffman properly calls the "noble language of the declaration of the liberties of the Church of Maryland"—language which is in point blank contradiction to the position which he sustains: "We consider it the undoubted right of the Protestant Episcopal Church, *in common with other Christian Churches*, under the American Revolution, to complete and preserve herself as *an entire Church*, agreeable to her ancient usages and professions, and to have the *full* enjoyment and free exercise of those purely spiritual powers, which are essential to the being of every Church or congregation, and which, being derived from Christ and His Apostles, are to be maintained independent of *every foreign or other jurisdiction*, so far as may be consistent with the rights of civil society."

II.—Not unlike this assumption of Judge Hoffman is the statement of the late Bishop Hopkins, that "THE OMISSION OF CERTAIN MATTERS IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH IS NOT EQUIVALENT TO THEIR PROHIBITION; AND THAT THE ENGLISH ECCLESIASTICAL LAW IS STILL OBLIGATORY IN THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES."

By the aid of this principle Bishop Hopkins passed into the Pre-Reformation Church of England, and found all its doctrines and ceremonies still binding on the Church of England and our Church, which had not been explicitly repealed. The argument by which he reaches this singular result is one of analogy from the statute and common law. He writes: "It is a settled rule in all courts of justice that every part of the statute and common law of England which was in force in the colonies and adapted to their circumstances before the war of Independence (with the single exception of what concerned the rights of the Crown) continued to be the law of the land, notwithstanding the Revolution, unless changed or done away by subsequent acts of our own legislature." Then the argument is drawn, that, as the common and statute law of England continued to be in force in the State, so the ecclesiastical law continues to be in force in the Church, except in so far as it has been changed by explicit legislation.

This analogy does not hold, because it is not *all* statute law, nor even all statute law which "might be shown to be applicable to our situation," but only that which by judicial authority has been recognized to have been in force previous to the Revolution, *which is now in force*. Hence the argument from the analogy fails, because no Judicial Ecclesiastical authority in our Church has ever given sanction to any other Ecclesiastical law than that of our Constitution and Canons.

Moreover, Bishop Hopkins has made an admission which completely nullifies his own argument, so far as it refers to the lawful use of other offices and ceremonies than those

authorized by our own Liturgy and Canons. He writes: "We have omitted the Athanasian Creed from its place in our former English Liturgy. It is true, therefore, that this Creed cannot be lawfully introduced in our public service, *which is fixed by our legislative authority.*" That is precisely my contention. It is to no purpose, that the Bishop adds that we have nowhere prohibited *the doctrine* of the Athanasian Creed. He admits that we have omitted the Creed, and that by virtue of its omission, *therefore*, it cannot lawfully be introduced into our public worship. This argument can be applied with equal force—nay, with greater force—to the exclusion of everything not found in our own Book, which is claimed by him and other Ritualists as lawful.

III.—ATTEMPTS AT LITURGICAL REVISION AND RELAXATION.

There have been two memorable attempts towards Rubrical revision and relaxation. The first one, proposed unanimously by the House of Bishops in 1826, created much excitement and alarm, and was dropped—none of the changes proposed having been adopted.

1. This movement originated with Bishop Hobart, of New York. In consequence of the omission of the Ante-Communion service very generally in Virginia and some other Dioceses, Bishop Hobart introduced some resolutions, the object of which was to give a certain discretion to the clergy, which would allow them to abbreviate some specified portions of the service if they desired to do so, but made the reading of the Ante-Communion service still obligatory.

The preamble was as follows: "The House of Bishops, solicitous to preserve unimpaired the Liturgy of the Church, yet desirous to remove the reasons alleged, from the supposed length of the service, for the omission of some of its parts, and particularly of the omission of that part of the Com-

munion office commonly called the Ante-Communion, unanimously propose the following alterations." The purport of these proposed changes was as follows:—

(1) The minister shall not be confined to the Psalter as divided, or to the selections, but may substitute any other Psalm or Psalms, except on those days when *Proper Psalms* are appointed.

(2) He may read only a portion of the lessons, but not less than fifteen verses. On other days than Sundays or Holy Days, he may read other portions of the Old and New Testaments than those which are appointed.

(3) Another and much improved Preface to the Confirmation Office was to be used.

(4) A new collect was to be added after the first collect in the Office of Confirmation, in which—to use the language employed by Bishop Hobart to explain its meaning—"In order to avoid the error of supposing that regeneration in Baptism is the renewing of the Holy Ghost, it is declared to be a titular kind of regeneration, or investment promissory, actual possession to be secured on the fulfilment of the terms of the Covenant."

(5) To remove all doubts as to the obligation to use the Ante-Communion service, a substitute for the first sentence in the Rubric immediately after the Communion office was proposed.

The resolutions embodying these proposed changes passed the House of Bishops *unanimously*, and the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies by a large majority. But they were not even brought before most of the Dioceses, and failed of being passed in the next Convention.

Bishop White makes the following statement: "It does not appear from the Journal, but is a fact which ought to be recorded in this place, that the proposal for abbreviation, as at first sent by the Bishops, contained the limiting of the use

of the Litany to seasons and days especially appointed for humiliation. This occasioned so great a sensation in the House of Clerical and Lay Delegates that the Bishops tacitly withdrew their communication, and then presented it in the form in which it now appears in the Journal." (Bishop White's Memoirs, pp. 52 and 251.)

2. A second attempt to secure Liturgical revision and relaxation was made in 1853. A memorial was signed and sent to the General Convention by several distinguished presbyters. It suggested the question whether the posture of our Church, with reference to the great moral and social necessities of the day, was all that could be desired or expected. It suggested more especially whether her usefulness might not be enlarged by relaxing somewhat the rigidness of her Liturgical services, and by conferring her orders on conditions somewhat less stringent. The Memorial was referred to a committee of five Bishops, viz., Bishops Otey, Doane, A. Potter, Burgess, and Williams.

(1) The questions, referring to the Liturgy, addressed by this committee to a large number of the clergy, were as follows: "Could changes be advantageously made in the services (a) by lengthening, shortening, or dividing them? (b) by adapting the lessons, anthems, &c., better to different Ecclesiastical seasons? (c) by a larger number of special services and prayers for special occasions? (d) by larger discretion in the use of hymns and of other sacred music? (e) by offices especially fitted for missionary services at home and abroad? (f) by allowing the authorities of each Diocese greater liberty?"

(2) In the following General Convention the committee made and offered, after some preliminary statements of the reasons for their recommendations, the following resolutions, viz.: That in the opinion of the Bishops (a) the order of Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the Communion Service, being separate offices, may, as in former times, be used sepa-

rately under the advice of the Bishop of the Diocese. (b) That on special occasions, or at extraordinary services, not otherwise provided for, ministers may, at their discretion, use such parts of the Book of Common Prayer and such lesson, or lessons, from the Holy Scripture, as shall in their judgment tend most to edification. (c) That the Bishops of the several Dioceses shall provide such special services as in their judgment shall be required by the peculiar spiritual necessities of any class or portion of the population within the Diocese, provided that such services shall not take the place of services or offices of the Book of Common Prayer in congregations capable of its use.

(3) In consequence of some animadversions having been made against this action of the House of Bishops, Bishop A. Potter, editor of "The Memorial Papers," made the following explanatory remarks:—

"The resolutions respecting the use of the Prayer Book express simply the *opinion* of the Bishops as to what under existing laws is allowable. They do not recommend that such liberty should everywhere be taken; they merely recognize the right to take it where there is sufficient occasion, and where the right is exercised under proper limitations.

Such an opinion, from such a source, was at the time the best way of preventing rash and unauthorized changes in our worship, and yet supplying relief and facilities felt by earnest workers to be indispensable.

In giving such opinion, the Bishops acted in strict conformity with their practice from the time that the General Convention was first established, with the rights which belong to every co-ordinate branch of a legislature, and with the proprieties as well as rights which, independent of their relation as members of the General Convention, pertain to them as fathers of the Church."

(4) Each Bishop in the Commission made a report or con-

tribution on one of the subjects assigned to him. To Bishop Burgess was assigned the Liturgical question. His contribution is very valuable. In reference to the abridgment of the service, he writes:—

"Of some forty written answers to the queries of the Commission on this point, almost all assented positively to the expediency of curtailment, and not one objected to it, at least in the form of divisions. While the Bishop does not regard the service as too long for Sundays, yet for week days, and in cases where several services are combined, *e. g.*, Ordination or Confirmation, he thinks that abbreviation should be allowed." "To refuse," he writes, "in instances like these, all power of abridging so long a service, cannot well subserve the edification of a people, and must impose an exhausting burden upon the officiating minister, and perhaps tempt to indecent haste."

In reference to a separation of the services, he writes: "If it should be doubted whether the universal usage which had so long prevailed might not have taken away the right to separate these services, which nevertheless our Bishops, in 1826, termed a reasonable and godly practice, yet now that it has been asserted and carried into effect, in particular instances, it must be held to be quite re-established."

In reference to assemblies which cannot be viewed as congregations of our Church, he writes that this is a case which the compilers of our Prayer Book were not called to anticipate. "It has now become real and frequent, and the ministers of the Church must often preach the Gospel, where the attempt to perform the entire service of an established worship would be incongruous, unsuccessful, and injurious. It appears that such of the clergy as have been engaged in Missionary labors, at home or in foreign lands, have generally felt themselves at liberty to yield, in such circumstances, to the law of manifest necessity and propriety, and so far to

abridge as seemed meet for edification." The Bishop then recommends that a course which is now so frequently and necessarily adopted should be formally sanctioned.

IV.—PRESENT LIBERTY ALLOWED IN THE USE OF THE LITURGY.

From what has been stated, I think it appears that it is not within the lawful liberty of the clergy to introduce new forms and ceremonies not contained in, nor provided for in our Liturgy; and that the changes which have been pronounced lawful, in the opinion of the Bishops, and by a joint resolution of the two Houses of the General Convention, are changes in the use of services already provided. The two chief guides, therefore, in the decision of the question of what is at present lawful, are the opinions expressed by the House of Bishops upon "the Memorial," and the joint resolution of the General Convention of 1874. While nothing has been done in the way of addition or omission in the Prayer Book itself, a large freedom—all, it would seem, that could be exercised to edification, and in consistency with the maintenance of a general uniform order throughout the Church—has been granted by the joint resolution to which I refer. In its terms it leaves the question, "*when it is desirable*," to use one of the three separate services of Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the order for the administration of the Lord's Supper, independently of each other, to the decision of each Rector. In view of the language of the resolution, the question arises, whether, if one should deem it *desirable* to use but one of the three offices throughout the year, he would be violating its letter or its intention? The resolution is as follows:—

"*Resolved* (the House of Bishops concurring), That it is the sense of this Convention that nothing in the present order of the Common Prayer prohibits the separation, when

desirable, of the Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the order for the administration of the Lord's Supper, into distinct services, which may be used independently of each other, and either of them without the others: *Provided*, that when used together they be used in the same order in which they have commonly been used, and in which they stand in the Book of Common Prayer."

My object in the present chapter has been to show what efforts have been made in the direction of further Liturgical liberty and relaxation, and adaptation to new needs; and what is now lawful under the present Constitution and Rubrics and Canons of the Church. I do not here discuss the large questions whether all Liturgical directions are general guidances rather than stringent laws; or how far they may be without blame modified under what is called "the rubric of common sense," or the more imperative rubric of high expediency or necessity. It is evident that great liberties, beyond those which are specified by the Church authorities as lawful, are taken, and are likely more and more to be taken, unless larger liberty is specifically granted by law. In view of this fact, and of the strongly felt need of giving more variety, freshness, and richness to our Liturgy, I cannot better conclude this brief history of the Prayer Book than by appending some wise warning words at the close of a sermon addressed to the Bishop White Prayer Book Society of Philadelphia, by the Rev. Dr Huntington, of Worcester (Nov. 24, 1878):—

"What destiny awaits the Book to which our evening thoughts have been given? That is a path not open to our tread The cloudy curtain screens the threshold of it. Still we may listen and imagine that we hear sounds. What if such a voice as this should come to us from the distance of a hundred years hence—a voice tinged with sadness and carrying just the least suggestion of reproach? 'Our

fathers,' the voice says, 'in the last quarter of the last century, forfeited a golden opportunity. It was a time of reconstruction in the State; social life was taking on the form it was destined long to retain; a great war had come to an end, its results were being registered. All things were fluent. Moreover, there happened, just then, to be an almost unparalleled lull in the strife of religious parties; men were more disposed than usual to agree; the interest in Liturgical search was at its greatest; and scholars knew and cared more than they have ever done since, about the history and structure of forms of prayer. Nevertheless, timid counsels prevailed; nothing was done with a view to better adapting the system to the needs of society; and the hope that the Church might cease to wear the dimensions of a sect, and might become the home of a great people, died unrealized. We struggle on, a half-hearted company, and try to live upon the high traditions and sweet memories of the past!'"

PART II.

EXPLANATIONS OF THE OFFICES AND RUBRICS OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

PART II.

EXPLANATIONS OF THE OFFICES AND RUBRICS OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

After the title of the Book, there follow the certificate of the correctness of the edition to which it is prefixed, the table of contents, the ratification by the General Convention on the 16th of October, 1789, the preface, the order for the reading of the Psalter and the Scriptures, the tables of Lessons of Holy Scripture for Sundays and Holy Days and all the days of the year, tables and rules for the movable and immovable feasts and fasts, and for finding Holy Days.

I.—CERTIFICATE OF THE CORRECTNESS OF THE EDITION OF THE PRAYER BOOK, AND THE TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The Bishop of a Diocese, or, where there is no Bishop, the Standing Committee, is directed by Canon 19, Title 1, § 1, to appoint one or more presbyters to compare and correct all new editions of the Prayer Book by a copy of the standard edition, and in case any edition shall be published without such correction, the Bishop, or, if there be no Bishop, the Standing Committee, shall give public notice that such

edition is not authorized by the Church. The octavo edition of the Prayer Book set forth by the General Convention of 1871, and published by the New York Bible and Common Prayer Book Society, is declared to be the standard edition.

The stereotype plates of this Book are consigned by the General Convention to a presbyter, who can make no changes in them except by the consent and advice of a Joint Committee of two Bishops and two presbyters appointed by the Convention; and all alterations thus made by the custodian shall be reported to the next General Convention and entered upon the Journal of the House of Deputies. These minute and elaborate provisions prevent the introduction of important changes, and form as complete a security against minor errors as could well be devised. As this arrangement furnishes a security that nothing new shall be introduced into the services that are provided, so the Table of Contents, also, by its enumeration of the services and offices of the Book, is a virtual prohibition of all services that are not there named.

II.—THE RATIFICATION OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

In the General Convention of 1789, on the 2d day of October, the Constitution was adopted, and in the VIIIth Article provision was made for a Book of Common Prayer for the use of the Church, in these words: "A Book of Common Prayer, Administration of Sacraments and Ceremonies of the Church, Articles of Religion, and a form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, when established by this or a future General Convention, shall be used in the Protestant Episcopal Church, which shall have adopted this Constitution." The following sentence was added to this VIIIth Article in 1811, viz.: "No alteration or addition shall be made in the Book of Common Prayer, or other offices of the Church, or the Articles of

Religion, unless the same shall be proposed in one General Convention, and by a resolve thereof made known to the Convention of every Diocese, and adopted at the subsequent General Convention."

In accordance with the provision of the first sentence of this Article, the ratification of the Prayer Book presented to the General Convention was made on the 16th day of October.

III.—THE PREFACE.

This admirable Introduction to the Prayer Book is chiefly due to the Reverend Dr. Smith. Dr. White had prepared and transmitted to Dr. Smith a draught of a preface for his consideration and revision; and Dr. Smith, instead of adopting it as a whole, composed one anew, in which he embodied some portions—the chief part, as he says—of that which was composed by Dr. White. In Dr. Smith's letter to Dr. White, he thus writes: "Enclosed you have my essay of a preface. The preface or address, which was a matter particularly entrusted to the Committee, I have ever considered a matter of great importance, as the first impressions on the introduction of the Book may be of serious concern. Of this the Church was sensible in Charles IId's time on the last review, when they wrote their several prefaces, giving their account of the reasons of all the alterations, the abolition of ceremonies, etc. I have, therefore, interwoven much of that preface, and, rather than to set forth what we have done ourselves, which is indeed but little, have given an account of what the wisest and best members of the Church of England have long wished to have done, in order to show that we are not pretending to be leaders in Reformation, but follow them and remain connected with them. This will set our work quite in a light wherein few consider it, and give a historical information with which the people in general of

our communion will be pleased, and be able to give an answer to gainsayers."

Dr. White, in reply to Dr. Smith, writes: "I like your preface, both in plan and execution. The particularities in mine are rendered unnecessary by the Articles you have inserted, as proposed at the Revolution." (Bishop Perry's Half Century of Legislation of the American Church, vol. 3, pp. 165, 167, 173–7.)

IV.—TABLES OF LESSONS OF HOLY SCRIPTURES.

1. *Tables for Sundays and Holy Days.*

The Tables of Sundays upon which Lessons are appointed to be read are the same in the English and American Book, with the single exception that in the former twenty-six Sundays after Trinity are provided for, whereas, in the latter, provision is made for twenty-seven. But while Lessons are appointed for all these Sundays, there are Collects, Epistles, and Gospels appointed for only twenty-five Sundays in both the American and English Book; and in both Books it is directed that the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for the twenty-fifth Sunday after Trinity are always to be used on the Sunday next before Advent.

The table of Holy Days is the same in the English and American Book, but while there are Collects, Epistles, and Gospels appointed for Ash Wednesday, and for Monday and Tuesday before Easter, there were, until recently, no lessons designated for either of these days. "The omission," says Shepherd, "cannot be accounted for. We must be content to attribute it to oversight or to some accident or mistake." Appropriate lessons have been appointed for these days in the American Book, and also in the lately revised Table of Lessons of the Church of England.

2. *Tables of Lessons for Every Day in the Year.*

A marked difference between these tables in the two Books is the omission, in the American Book, of about sixty names of so-called (in some cases justly called) saints and martyrs, or the commemoration of some events, which are inserted in the English Book. None of these days were included in either of the Books of Edward VI., except St. George's Day, Lammas Day, St. Lawrence, and St. Clement. They were restored at the revision under Elizabeth, but their observance was not only not enjoined, but (according to Wheatley) it was forbidden. The reasons rendered for their re-insertion from the Papal calendar rest wholly on the grounds of expediency and policy. Some are said to be retained because the courts of justice were accustomed to refer to them as the days upon which, or near which they made their decisions and returns; others were left because tradesmen and handicraftsmen were accustomed to celebrate the memory of their tutelar saints on the days indicated in the calendar, and some, because in places where churches have been dedicated to these saints, the people were accustomed to keep wakes or fairs on the days in which their names were commemorated, and they would be dissatisfied if such names were omitted. These reasons, in our day, would seem to be good rather for the omission than the retention of these names. Moreover, it is difficult to see on what grounds of religious or ecclesiastical propriety the names of Charles I., and especially that of Charles II., should be inserted, and those of King Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth omitted.

In our Book only the prominent events in the life of the Saviour, and the Festivals of the twelve Apostles, of St. Michael and All Angels, All Saints, Innocents, and the Annunciation and Purification of the Virgin Mary are retained. But, as Wheatley remarks, in reference to the An-

nunciation and Purification, that, "though they may have some relation to the Blessed Virgin, do yet more peculiarly belong to the Saviour. The Prayer Book title of the former of these is "The Presentation of Christ in the Temple, commonly called the Purification."

V.—TABLES AND RULES FOR MOVABLE AND IMMOVABLE FEASTS, ETC.

1. *Easter Day.**

The pivotal day for adjusting the Movable Feasts is, as is well known, EASTER DAY. The rules by which the time of that "Queen of Feasts" is ascertained are given with sufficient clearness and fulness in the Book, and the Tables for permanent use have been prepared with the utmost care and exactness. This feast, like the Jewish Passover, is regulated by what may be called the Vernal Full moon. The Jews, following the directions of Moses (Exodus xii. 6), offered the Paschal Sacrifice on the fourteenth day of the first month, *i. e.*, the month in which the Vernal Equinox occurs. They used great care to ascertain the date of the new moon, and from it counted two weeks to the Paschal Feast. The Christian Church, in order to secure the observance of the festival upon Sunday, the first day of the week, in memory of the Lord's Resurrection, was obliged to adopt a somewhat different mode of computation. Fixing the Equinox for the 21st of March in each year, the Council of Nice decreed that Easter should be celebrated on the Sunday following the full moon which happens upon or next after March 21, so that if the moon of the Vernal Equinox should be full on

* For the remainder of this chapter I am indebted to my friend the Rev. R. B. Claxton, D.D., Rector of St. Andrew's Church, West Philadelphia.

Sunday, Easter Day would be delayed for a whole week. There is thus left a wide range, from March 22 until April 25, during which time the great Feast may be celebrated. This variation, of course, affects all the Sundays in Lent, and the three which immediately precede that season, so that the number of Sundays after Epiphany will be more or fewer according as Easter comes later or earlier. A like result is found with regard to the number of Sundays between Trinity and Advent, of which, when Easter is early, there may be 27, when late, there may be only 22. Ascension Day is properly fixed for the fortieth day after Easter (Acts i. 3), and Whitsunday for the fiftieth day, as the Jewish Pentecost, or Feast of Weeks, was just seven weeks after the Passover. Our Calendar thus secures the celebration of this Feast upon Sunday, in accordance with the day of the great event then commemorated.

The Church Calendar, it should be observed, has a computation of the time of the Full Moon varying, in some years, from the Almanac time. A fixed meridian of longitude had to be determined, else there might possibly be an observance of Easter on different days in the two hemispheres. The fourteenth day of the moon is arbitrarily assumed as the day of Full Moon, whether it exactly accord with the Astronomical fact or not.

The Tables given in our Prayer Book use three or four words which deserve some remark.

(*a*) The Golden Number.—More than four hundred years before the Christian Era, Meton, a Greek, observed the fact that after the lapse of nineteen years, the age of the moon and the date of the month always coincide with what they were at the beginning of that period, hence this cycle of nineteen years became known as the Metonic cycle. The number of each year in that cycle was ordered to be engrossed in letters of gold on a marble pillar. On introducing

the Gregorian Calendar, the point from which the Golden Numbers should be counted was fixed for 1 B. C., "as in that year the new moon fell on the 1st of January." From this was derived the Prayer Book rule for ascertaining the Golden Number for any particular year.

(*b*) THE EPACT.—This word, from the Greek ἐπακτός, refers to the age of the moon on the first day of the current year. The lunar year has 12 lunations of 29½ days each, making 354 days. The solar year, as is known to all, exceeds this by 11 days, and in Leap-years (for which the Tables make provision) by 12 days. The Epact for 1879 having been 7, we add 11, making it 18 for 1880. This being Leap-year we add 12 for 1881, deducting 30 we have no remainder, and the moon will be new on the last day of 1880.

(*c*) THE SUNDAY LETTER.—The first seven letters of the Alphabet are assigned to the first seven days of the year, and the date of the first Sunday determines the Sunday letter for the year, only that in Leap-years the Sundays after Feb. 29 will have the letter next preceding. A complete revolution in the Dominical letter takes place at the end of 28 years, making a Solar Cycle, a fact that seems to have been made known (if not then first discovered) about the time of the Nicene Council.

It does not seem needful to dwell at length upon the "TABLE OF FEASTS." The English Prayer Book speaks of "Vigils" before certain Feasts; nine of the Apostles being there named, while St. Philip and St. James, St. John and St. Paul have no such preparation for their Festival days: probably because their occurrence was during what were regarded as seasons of especial joy.*

The American book gives chief distinction to only two

* Our Church, by omitting all notice of these "Vigils," teaches us that their observance is undesirable.

days, as. in a superior sense, Fasts; viz., Ash-Wednesday and Good-Friday. Other days are named as those on which "the Church requires such a Measure of Abstinence, as is more especially suited to extraordinary acts and exercises of Devotion." It is a part of the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free that the details of these duties are left to the conscience and the judgment of individual worshippers.

The Forty days of Lent are too well known to need comment here. Happily there is but one mind in the Church as to the spiritual profit that may be derived from their rightful use.

The Ember-Days at the Four Seasons are probably the outgrowth of a desire to follow the example of the Apostolic Church in Antioch (Acts 13, 2) in which special prayers and fasting preceded the solemnities of something like an ordination.

The Rogation-Days derive their name from the Latin "Rogare," to pray or supplicate. No especial service has been provided for these days, either in our own Church or in the Church of England. The Lent Lectionary, recently authorized by our General Convention, is accompanied by selected Lessons for the Ember-Days and the Rogation-Days likewise. The chief interest of these last would seem to be found in that they are meant to be used as a preparation for celebrating our Lord's Ascension.

CHAPTER II.

MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER.

I.—SOURCES OF THE PRAYER BOOK.

The order for Daily Morning and Evening Prayer is taken in large part from the ancient Liturgy of Sarum; but it is also indebted to the Liturgy of Nuremberg, composed by Melancthon and Bucer, and to other formularies of the Continental Churches.

As much light is thrown upon the meaning of our Liturgy by the examination of the points in which it differs from or agrees with that of the Church of England, which it so closely follows—and as the study of that Liturgy in itself, and in its relation to the whole subject of Liturgies, is instructive and important, I shall examine and explain, with some degree of fulness, the Rubrics and Offices of the latter. It is the more needful to ascertain precisely what are Law and Liberty under the English Liturgy, because there are those in our Church, as we have seen in the Historical Lectures upon our Prayer Book, who look upon the regulations and practices of the English Church, as furnishing precedents and vindications for the introduction of ceremonies and Offices which have received no sanction in our Book of Common Prayer.

II.—DAILY SERVICE IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

The title of the order for Morning and Evening Prayer in the English Book seems to imply that it should be said daily. It is as follows: "The order for Morning and Evening Prayer *daily to be said and used* throughout the year." The Rubric

also, at the end of the preface directs that "all priests and deacons are to say *daily* the Morning and Evening Prayer, either privately or openly, not being let by sickness or some other urgent cause."

This seemingly absolute direction, however, is modified by the Rubric which follows, which enjoins that "the curate which ministers in every parish Church or Chapel, being at home or not otherwise reasonably hindered, shall say the same in the parish Church or Chapel where he ministereth, and shall cause a bell to be tolled thereunto a convenient time before he begin, that the people may come to hear God's Word and pray with him."

It is to be observed that by the first Rubric all ministers—those who officiate in Churches and all others—are directed to say Morning and Evening Prayer, unless they are let by sickness or other urgent cause. Only sickness or other *urgent cause* is allowed as a sufficient reason for the omission of the Daily Service. In the Second Book of Edward the Rubric was less stringent. It directed that "the service should be said daily by all priests and deacons, unless they were letted by preaching, studying divinity, or some other cause."

The second Rubric makes an exception in the case of curates in charge of Churches or Chapels when they are "reasonably hindered." What constitutes a "reasonable hindrance" is not here or elsewhere specified, and must, therefore, be left to the conscience and judgment of the curate.

By Rubrical law, therefore, daily service is enjoined in the Church of England upon all ministers who have no parochial charge, except in cases where they are *letted* by sickness or other *urgent* cause; and upon parish clergymen except in cases where there is a reasonable hindrance.

But this regulation has not been enforced or generally

practised in the Church of England at any time since the Reformation. This appears from the fact that Orders and Injunctions were issued as early as 1549, and on many other subsequent occasions, for the celebration of Divine Service on Wednesdays, and Fridays, and Holy Days, which leads to the inference that there was not a daily service. The XIVth and XVth Canons of 1604 also require service to be performed on those days. (Proctor on Common Prayer, 195–6. Blakeney, 253–5.)

III.—ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THE OBLIGATION TO PERFORM THE SERVICE DAILY.

An argument for the Daily Service is drawn from the language of the Rubrics, which in directing that it shall be said or read daily, unless there be reasonable hindrance or urgent cause, implies that in the absence of these impediments the duty is expected to be performed. This argument is enforced by the example of some of the most eminent and devout divines of the Church—Herbert, Ferrar, Sherlock, Bull, and others. But, on the other hand, the original intention of the Rubric to enforce Daily Prayer has been questioned by high authority. Bishop Blomfield, late Bishop of London, says "that the framers of the Rubric did not intend to insist upon an uninterrupted daily performance of the divine service appears, I think, from the direction given to the curate that *when* it is performed, he shall cause the bell to be tolled a convenient time before, to give the people notice." The late Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Pepys) says: "I must express my doubts whether the compilers of our Liturgy ever contemplated the performance of the Daily Service generally in the parochial Churches of the Kingdom." (Blakeney, pp. 253–4.)

The Reverend J. Craigie Robertson (How shall we Conform

to the Liturgy? pp. 45–55) gives many proofs that it was not required and not generally practised.

IV.—DAILY SERVICE NOT ENJOINED IN OUR BOOK.

In the Prayer Book of our Church the title for the order for Daily Prayer does not imply, as that of the English Book *seems* to do, that it is to be "daily said and used." The title is "The Order for Daily Morning and Evening Prayer." Lessons, indeed, have been provided for every day in the year; but this has been done in order that provision may be made for any day upon which Divine Service may be celebrated; and the language prefixed to the Tables of Lessons for Sundays and Holy Days is to the effect that they "are to be read" on those days; whereas, the other Tables for the respective months are simply prefaced by the words, "Lessons *for* January," etc. The omission of both the Rubrics of the English Books, and the practice subsequent to the adoption of our Liturgy, show that the title, "The Order for Daily Morning and Evening Prayer," does not render the saying of the Daily Service obligatory upon the ministers of our Church.

Daily Service.—The duty of daily public worship was, as might be expected, chiefly insisted upon by the High Churchmen of the period. Thus we find Robert Nelson urging it. There were very few men of business, he said, who might not certainly so contrive their affairs as frequently to dedicate half an hour in their four-and-twenty to the public service of God. Dodwell's biographer speaks of the great attention he paid to the daily prayers of the Church. Bull introduced to Bricknok daily prayers, instead of their being only on Wednesday and Friday; and at Carmarthen Morning and Evening Prayers, whereas there had been only Morning Prayers before. In 1712 they were kept up and well attended. The custom, however, was by no means confined to High Churchmen. Thorseby, while he was yet more than half a Dissenter, feeling, for instance, much scruple as to the use of the Cross in Baptism, performed public service twice every day.

Some time before the century had run through half its course, daily

services were fast becoming exceptional even in the towns. The later hours broke the whole tradition and made it more inconvenient for busy people to attend them. Year after year they were more thinly attended and one Church after another in quick succession discontinued holding them. It was one sign among many others of an increasing apathy in religious matters. At places like Bath or Tunbridge Wells the Churches were still open and tolerably full morning and evening. Elsewhere, if a daily Morning and Evening Service were kept up, the congregation was sure to consist only of a few women; and the Bridget or Cecilia who was regularly there was sure of being accounted, by not a few of her neighbors, prude, devotee, or Methodist. In many London parishes special provisions had been made, either by endowment or voluntary subscriptions, for the maintenance of daily services. Where the latter was the case, the subscription began rapidly to fall off. Malcolm has preserved a correspondence which passed in 1758 between Bishop Newton of Bristol, and the united parishes of Mary-le-Barr, St. Pancras, and Allhallows, of which, in accordance with the bad custom of the times, he continued to be Rector. The Bishop laments the discontinuance almost to nothing of the subscription. The parishioners acknowledge that it is so; but argue that if the Rector desires these services to be held, it should devolve upon him to provide them. They allow that attendance at Morning Prayers has been generally omitted, but that they are by no means convinced of their propriety. At the end of the century, and on to the end of the Georgian period, it became rarer still. (English Church in the XVIIIth Century, Vol. 2.)

V.—PLACE AT WHICH MORNING PRAYER SHALL BE SAID.

The First Book of Edward directed the Priest to perform the service in the choir. The Second Book directed that it should be used "in such place of the Church, Chapel, or Chancel, and the Minister so turn him as the people may best hear." If any controversy arose, the matter was to be decided by the Ordinary. In 1559 it was ordered that the service should be read in "the accustomed place," except it should be otherwise determined by the Ordinary. The Canons of 1604 (XIV. and LXXXII.) direct that a seat or desk shall be so placed in the body of the Church or Chancel "as

that the people may be most edified." The custom of reading service at this Desk outside of the Chancel, or in the body of the larger Churches, became general. The evident purpose of these directions was to have the service so read that it could be heard by all the congregation, in order that the people might join in it, and thus the service be made what it was called—Common Prayer.

The present Rubric of the English Church which repeats that of Elizabeth, that the Morning Prayer shall be said in the accustomed place, must have meant by the "accustomed place," the seat which was directed by Injunctions early in the reign of Elizabeth, and subsequently by Canons in 1604, to be placed where the people could best hear and be edified. This is admitted by Wheatley (On Common Prayer, 106–8). Mr. Robertson, citing LXXXIInd Canon, that on occasions of Communion the Holy Table shall so stand, as that the people best may hear, writes: "It is evident that the framers of the Canons did not contemplate the ministers officiating at the Table, except on occasions of actual Communion. This would exclude the reading of the Ante-Communion Service at the Table, and much more the Morning and Evening Prayer." The custom of reading the Morning and Evening Prayer at the Communion Table was plainly not intended to be sanctioned by Rubric after the First Book of Edward, and until recently has been but little practised in our Church, or in the Church of England.

Inasmuch as these directions are omitted in our Book, and as the custom was not uniform in our Churches at the time of its adoption—prayers having been read variously, at the Communion Table, or at a Reading Desk outside or within the Chancel—either of these methods appears to be lawful in our Church.

VI.—POSITION OF THE OFFICIATING MINISTER.

The same Rubrics which directed that the reading pew and the Communion Table should so stand as that the people best might hear and be edified, involved the necessity, also, that the minister in reading should stand in such a position that his voice would be the more readily heard. Accordingly, there are directions also upon the posture of the Minister, as well as upon the position of the Table and the Desk. In the Rubric of 1552, the Minister is directed *so to turn him* as the people best may hear. The same direction was given as to the reading of the lessons. The Injunctions of the Archbishops in Elizabeth's reign are to the same effect (Strype's Parker, Vol. 1, p. 157). Among the Injunctions of Grindal to the laity of York is the following: "*Item:* to the intent that the people may better hear the Morning and Evening Prayer, when the same by the Minister is said, and be the more edified thereby, we do enjoin the Wardens of every Parish Church shall procure a decent low pulpit to be erected, and made in the body of the Church, out of hand, wherein the Minister shall stand *with his face towards the people* when he readeth Morning and Evening Prayer; provided always, that where the Churches are very small, it shall suffice that the Minister shall stand in his accustomed stall in the choir, so that a convenient desk or lectern *with room to turn his face towards the people* be there provided by the Church Wardens at the charges of the Parish" (Strype's Parker, Vol. 1, p. 132).

From these Injunctions it appears that in very small Churches, where the minister stood in his accustomed stall, he was to read the prayers at a desk or lectern with his face towards the people. The awkward custom of reading prayers with the face towards the opposite side of the chancel, and the objectionable custom of reading them with the back

towards the people, were both evidently intended to be prevented by the Rubrics, and by the Injunctions which constitute their contemporary and official interpretation. The complaints which were made of the violation of these Rubrics prove that such were the customs which they were intended to prevent. Strype, in his Annals of 1559, mentions that complaints were made of lay readers, appointed to read the service, from the want of clergymen, "that when they read they turned their backs to the people (that they might stand after the old fashion) with their faces to the Altar."

Pews.—Before the period commenced (viz., the XVIIIth Century) pews had become everywhere general. In Mediæval times there had been, properly speaking, none. A few distinguished people were permitted as a special privilege to have their private closets furnished, very much like the grand pews of later days, with cushions, carpets, and curtains. But as an almost universal rule, the nave was unincumbered with any permanent seats, and only provided with a few portable stools for the aged and infirm. Pews began to be introduced in Henry the VIII.'s time, notwithstanding the protests of Sir Thos. Moore and others. Under Elizabeth they became more frequent in town Churches. In Charles I.'s time they had so far gained ground as to be often a source of hot and even riotous contention between those who opposed them and those who insisted on erecting them. Even in Charles II.'s reign they were exceptional rather than otherwise, and the term had not become limited to boxes in the Church. Pepys writes in his Diary on February 18, 1688: "At Christ Church there was my lady Brouncker and Mrs. Williams in our pew." On the 25th of the same month we find the following entry: "At the play my wife sat in my lady Fox's pew with her." Sir Christopher Wren was not at all pleased to see them introduced to his London Churches. During the luxurious self-indulgent times which followed the Restoration, private pews of all sorts and shapes gained a general footing. Before Queen Anne's reign was over they had become so regular a part of the ordinary furniture of a Church, that the regulation was approved in 1712 by both houses of Convocation for the Consecrating of Churches and Chapels, that it is specially enjoined that the Church be previously pewed. Twelve years, however, later than this they were evidently by no means universal in

country places. In 1725 Swift, enumerating the plagues of a country life, makes "a Church without pews" a special item of his list. But "paved, pewed, and wainscoted" had been for many years past the characteristic formula which recorded the Church restorations of the period. There are plenty of allusions in the writings of contemporary poets and essayists to the cosey sleep-provoking structures in which people of fashion and well-to-do citizens can enjoy without attracting too much notice—

"the Sunday due
Of slumbering in an upper pew."

In Swift's humorous Metamorphosis—

"A bedstead of the antique mode,
Compact of timber many a load,
Such as our ancestors did use,
Was metamorphosed into pews;
Which still their ancient nature keep
By lodging folks disposed to sleep."

Those of the more exclusive sort were often built up of tall partitions, like Lady Booby's in her pew, which the congregation could not see into. Sometimes they were curtained, sometimes filled with sofas and tables, or even provided with fire-places; and cases might be quoted where the tedium of a long service or the appetite engendered by it was relieved by the entry between prayers and sermon of a livery servant with sherry and light refreshments. Even into Cathedrals cumbrous ladies' pews were often introduced. * * * Everywhere the pew system reigned uncontrolled, pampering self-indulgence, fostering jealousies, too often thrusting back the poor into mean, comfortless sittings, in whatever part of the Church was coldest, darkest, and most distant from sight and hearing. * * * "I would reprobate," wrote Mrs. Barbauld (1790), "those little gloomy solitary cells, planned by the spirit of aristocracy, which deform the building no less to the eye of taste than to the eye of benevolence, and, insulating each family within its separate enclosure, favor at once the pride of rank and the laziness of indulgence." (English Church in the XVIIIth Century, Vol. 2, pp. 421–24.)

VII.—VESTMENTS.

Inasmuch as the Rubric in the English Book, which provides that the ornaments of the Churches and Ministers thereof shall be retained which were in use in the second

year of Edward VI., is omitted in our Book, that direction is neither our law nor our liberty. The only directions in our Book concerning vestments are the Rubrics, in the Ordination offices for deacons and priests, which provide that they shall be "*decently* habited;" and in the Office for the Consecration of a Bishop, in which it is declared that at the Consecration "the Bishop elect shall be vested with his rochet, and that, after answering the questions put to him, he shall put on the rest of the Episcopal habit." Interpreted by uniform usage, the evident intention of our Church is that the surplice and stole shall be used in the performance of the service, and the gown in preaching; and that the Bishop shall wear the Episcopal robes in use in the English Church at the time of the adoption of our services. In addition to the Rubric which directs that deacons and priests shall be decently (*i. e.*, appropriately or becomingly) habited, there is an incidental mention, in the proceedings of the House of Bishops in 1814, of the dress of ordained clergymen in the performance of the service. A Canon (No. X.) of 1804 directs that the Bishop or Ecclesiastical authority of a Diocese shall limit every lay reader, who is a candidate for orders, "to such part or parts of the Common Prayer, *to such dress*, and to such stations in the Church, as are appropriate only to lay readers." Some doubts having arisen as to the interpretation of the above Rubric, the House of Bishops in the Convention of 1814 gave the following statement of their understanding of its meaning: "They conceive that the design of the Canon reaches every circumstance of position and of dress, which the custom of the Church and the habits of social life may render liable to misconception in the premises. On this ground the House of Bishops consider it as contrary to the design of the Canon for Candidates to read sermons from the places usually considered as appropriated to ordained ministers, or to appear *in bands or gowns or surplices*."

The custom, therefore, for three-quarters of a century after the organization of our Church, was for the clergy to wear the surplice and bands in the performance of the Morning and Evening Prayer and in other services, and the gown in preaching. This was recognized as what was understood by the Rubric, interpreted by this Canon and its explanations; although it was not always rigidly adhered to in all the Dioceses, especially in Virginia, where only the gown was used in several parishes until quite a recent period.

Archdeacon Sharp (On the Rubric, pp. 206–7), treating of the use of the surplice in preaching, writes: "There is nothing in our Rubrics that doth directly authorize this usage, or in the Canons that doth authorize it; nay, there is something in both which would discourage, if not forbid such a practice. The Canons limit the use of the surplice to the public prayers and ministering the Sacraments and other rites of the Church;" and so doth our Rubric concerning habits, if it be strictly interpreted by King Edward's order in the second year of his reign, for there the surplice is only to be used at Matins and even song, in Baptizing, and Burying in Parish Churches, and then there immediately follows this permission, that in all other places every Minister shall be at liberty to use any surplice or no, and also a recommendation to such as are graduates, that "when they preach they shall use such hoods as pertain to their several degrees. Here is a sufficient authority for using a hood without a surplice, as is done at this day at the Universities, but no appearance of authority for the use of surplices in the pulpit." This view is also maintained in the very learned and elaborate treatise of the Rev. Mr. Harrison in his "Historical Inquiry," etc., "on the Dress of the Preacher." It is not too much to say that he has shown conclusively that the preponderance of authorities is in favor of the gown as the proper preaching vestment (pp. 1–189).

But a recent decision (of 1871, in the Purchas Case), by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, declares that the direction, that the surplice shall be used on all occasions of public ministration, includes preaching as one of the ministrations in which it is to be used. The present law of the Church of England, therefore, is that the surplice shall be worn in preaching. The custom of preaching in the surplice has become very frequent in our Church, and is in itself unobjectionable; although it is felt by many to be less convenient as a preaching garment than the gown, and that it fails to mark the distinction, that in the performance of the service the clergyman speaks as the organ of the Church, and in the sermon he occupies the position of an individual teacher.

The Surplice was, of course, throughout this period the universally recognized vestment of the clergy of the Church of England. Not that it had altogether outlived the unreasoning hatred with which it was regarded by the ultra-Protestants outside the National Church. It was still in the earlier part of the century inveighed against by some of their writers as a "Babylonish garment," a rag of the Whore of Babylon, a habit of the Priests of Isis. In Wm. III.'s time its use in the pulpit was evidently quite exceptional. The writer of a letter in the Strype correspondence—one of those in whose eyes the surplice was a fool's coat—making mention that on the preceding Sunday he had seen a clergyman preach in one, added that to the best of his remembrance he had never seen one before. During the next reign the custom was more common, but it was looked upon as a decided mark of High Churchmanship. * * * About this date (Queen Anne's) the growing habit among clergymen of wearing a wig is said to have caused an alteration from the older form of the surplice. It was no longer sewn up and drawn over the head but made open in front.* (English Church in the XVIIIth Century.)

---

* Pepys mentions that he saw a clergyman, after prayers, pull the surplice over his head in the reading desk, and, as his gown was under his surplice, he was not compelled to go to the Vestry room to change his robes.

VIII.—THE FIRST RUBRIC, THE SENTENCES, EXHORTATION, CONFESSION, AND ABSOLUTION.

The English Rubric directs that the Minister shall read with a *loud voice* some one or more of the sentences that follow. The direction to read with a loud voice was, no doubt, given because of the low and mumbling tone in which those who had been accustomed to read the Latin Mass would naturally fall. That direction, retained in the English Liturgy from the first Book of Edward, was omitted as unnecessary in our Book.

The first three sentences were added to our Book as suitable to prepare the minds of the worshippers for devotion, and as expressive of the hope and duty of the Church that it would ultimately extend from "the rising of the sun even to the going down of the same."

The first Book of Edward commenced as did the early Liturgies, with the Lord's Prayer. Neither of the above named offices was in that Book. They were added in the second Book of Edward, and are taken with considerable modifications from the Liturgy composed for the French and German congregations in England, and were severally drawn up by Vallerandus Pollanus and John Alasco.

The *Exhortation* connects the sentences with the confession. It shows that confession of sin is enjoined by Scripture and that it is peculiarly proper in public worship, teaches how it should be performed, and urges to its performance.

The *Confession* is called *general* because it is to be repeated by all the Congregation. It consists of two parts—the first a confession of sin, and the second a supplication for pardon of the past and grace for the future.

The rubric requires that it shall be said by the whole congregation *after* the Minister, and the interpretation and practice of the English Church is that the Minister shall say

every clause, and that the people shall repeat that clause after it shall have been pronounced by him. The practice in our Church was generally the same until in the General Convention of 1835 the following preamble and resolution were adopted by the House of Clerical and Lay deputies, and transmitted to the House of Bishops.

"Inasmuch as, according to the judgment of this Convention, it is rightly designed that the Confessions, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer, in the Liturgy of our Church should be in all cases the joint acts of Minister and people, and be confirmed in the united declaration of their consent in the word 'Amen;'—contrary to a practice which is recently found in some of our Churches, according to which the Minister pronounces the Confession, sentence by sentence, by *himself*, the people repeating each sentence after the Minister by *themselves*, and concluding with the word 'Amen,' as their response, in which the Minister does not unite: therefore, Resolved, that the attention of the House of Bishops to this matter be respectfully requested, in order that, should they concur in the opinion here expressed, such measures may be taken as shall maintain uniformity of practice in this behalf, in conformity to ancient usage." (Perry's Journals, Vol. 2, p. 575.)

The Committee of the House of Bishops to whom this action was referred reported favorably upon the resolution of the Lower House, in the following words: "In the opinion of your Committee, a regard to uniformity with what is practised in other parts of the Liturgy, and also for the avoidance of a needless addition to the length of the service, and to its most decent performance, requires that, in repeating the General Confession in the Morning and Evening Prayer, the people should unite with the minister in saying it after him, in the same manner as is usually practised in the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Confession in the Communion

Service." (Perry, Vol. 2, p. 665.) The custom thus recommended by the General Convention has since that action universally obtained. It was not found necessary to change the Rubric, inasmuch as the repetition of the word with the minister, he leading, was considered as, in a true sense, repeating it *after* him.

The *Absolution* is called in the English Book, "The absolution or remission of sins." Our Book calls it more accurately, "*the declaration* of absolution or remission of sins." And in order still further to avoid the impression that an authoritative absolution is pronounced, our Church has transferred to this place the form in the Communion Service, which is simply precatory.

IX.—THE RUBRIC BEFORE THE DECLARATION OF ABSOLUTION.

In both the English Book and our own the Rubric directs that the Declaration of Absolution shall be pronounced by the *priest* alone. The interpretation and the almost universal practice in both Churches has been that deacons and laymen are not allowed to pronounce it. It has been regarded as the exclusive prerogative of Bishops and presbyters to pronounce this formula. The chief arguments for this interpretation are as follows:—

1. The explicit direction of the Rubric that it shall be pronounced by the priest alone.

2. The almost universal practice in accordance with this interpretation.

3. The great preponderance of Ritual authorities in favor of this interpretation. (Stephen's Pr. Bk., Vol. 1, p. 407.)

4. The substitution of the word *priest* for minister at the last review.

5. The evident intention of the Commissioners at the Savoy Conference to limit this function to presbyters. In

reply to the Puritans, who desired that the word *minister* should everywhere be substituted for priest, they declare that it is fit that some such word should be added for the offices of absolution and consecration of the elements in the Lord's Supper, and not *minister*, which signifies at large any one that ministers in that holy office, of whatever order he may be.

On the other hand, in reply to these arguments, and in support of the opposite opinion, the following statements have been made.

It is urged that the language of the Rubric is perfectly consistent with the interpretation that the Absolution may be pronounced by a deacon. The preceding Rubric directs, "A General Confession to be said of the *whole Congregation* after the *minister*, all kneeling." The Rubric, therefore, it is claimed, by the word *alone* may mean that the officiating minister *alone*, and not the whole congregation with him or after him, as in the Confession, should repeat the Absolution. The Rubric before the absolution, previous to the last review in 1662, directed that it should be pronounced by the *Minister* alone. Hence, it is argued that, as the word covers alike all classes of ministers, it includes deacons, and that, therefore, before the last review it must, beyond doubt, have contemplated deacons as competent to pronounce absolution. The word priest was no doubt *intended* by the Convocation of 1662 to limit the pronouncing of the Absolution to presbyters, but it failed to carry its intention into effect, because, as we shall see, it left the language of the Rubric precisely the same as that which *did* allow the ministrations of deacons, as well as of priests, in several offices.

Moreover, it is contended that the practice of limiting the use of the Absolution to the priest has not been uniform, and that it was not until the last review that it became a rule. The high Ritualistic author, Maskell (on Absolution, London,

1849), says that "deacons were allowed to perform this part of public prayers." Blakeney says "so were lay readers." (Blakeney, p. 326.)

While it must be admitted that Ritual authorities preponderate in favor of the other interpretation, yet there are high authorities also on this side. Maskell, and Bennet, and Warner declare that a deacon may pronounce the absolution. The language of the latter is as follows: "Nothing can be clearer than that this distinction of *priest alone* means the minister without the people. The Confession preceding it is said of the whole congregation after the minister, all kneeling; and then comes the absolution, pronounced by the priest alone standing, the people still kneeling. This was, therefore, intended to direct the people not to repeat the words after the minister, as they had been directed in the Confession, but to attend silently until he had pronounced it, and then to say 'Amen!' The word minister and the word priest, Dr. Bennet observes, are in this and other offices used indiscriminately." (Warner's Illustrated Pr. Bk., *in loco*, 1754.)

While it is evident that the change of the word minister to priest in 1662, by the Convocation, in accordance with the views of the Episcopal Commissioners of the Savoy Conference, was *intended* to limit the declaration of Absolution to the presbyter (which is accomplished in the Scotch Book by the direction, "by the *presbyter* alone"), it failed to effect that object, by the use of the word priest. For it is obvious that the words priest and minister are used very generally, as Dr. Bennet observes, promiscuously and interchangeably in various offices. Dr. Nicholls, indeed, remarks, that the word priest was *never* equivalent to the minister officiating, of whatever order he may be; and that the word minister *always* signifies a priest ministering or officiating (Stephen's P. Bk., Vol. 1, p. 408). But Stephens, who approves the conclusion to which he comes, objects to the former statement, that "in the versicles imme-

diately preceding the Lord's Prayer 'priest' is used for the minister officiating." (Ibid. p. 408.) The same fact appears from various other portions of the service. In the English Book the *priest* in the Ante-Communion is to say the Lord's Prayer, and also the Ten Commandments; in the Baptismal Service it is "directed that the *priest* coming to the font," &c., the "*priest* shall say," &c. But all these offices may be performed by a deacon. In our Book the word minister is in many places substituted in the Communion office for priest, and everywhere in the Baptismal office. Hence it appears that the remarks of Dr. Nicholls are not well founded as to the English Book, and that still less could they be applied to our own. The word *priest is* often used as synonomous with officiating *minister;* and the word minister is by no means *always* used to signify the presbyter officiating. In our Baptismal service it *never* means exclusively the presbyter; but includes him together with the Bishop and deacon. From these facts it has been argued that if the word priest (in the English Book) does not exclude the deacon from baptizing, nor from repeating certain portions of the Ante-Communion service, neither does it exclude him from absolving.

The Absolution sets forth that "God hath given power and commandment *to his ministers* to declare," &c. But that deacons are ministers appears from the declaration of the preface to the Ordinal which refers to three orders of ministers: Bishops, priests, and deacons. Therefore the Absolution, it is claimed, pertains to deacons.

The last Act of Uniformity is careful to specify some things which a deacon should not do, but which had been done by him irregularly and improperly in previous times. He should not consecrate the Lord's Supper, nor hold benefices. "Why," it is asked, "was he not also prohibited from pronouncing Absolution?"

Again, it is asked, Why if the deacon can perform the func-

tion of baptizing which introduces one into the Church and —upon the theory of those who are strenuous to exclude them from pronouncing the benediction—confers the greatest of all blessings, even spiritual regeneration, why should he be forbidden to exercise the certainly not greater functions of God's Forgiveness of the penitent?

The last two arguments are available only to show the probability that deacons would be empowered to pronounce the Absolution and not the fact that they were so.

The force of that portion of the above argument which turns on the use of the words *priest* and *minister* is much lessened, if not actually nullified, as it seems to me to be, in the case of the American Prayer Book, by the fact that in our review care was taken to use the word *minister* where either of the three orders could officiate, and the word *priest* where the duty was limited to a presbyter or Bishop.

3. From this review it appears that the original intention of the Rubric was to direct that whereas the Confession was to be said by both minister and people, the Absolution was to be said by the *minister* whether presbyter or deacon, *alone;* that there are high Ritual authorities for this interpretation, who contend that such is the present law, though not the custom of the English Church; that, on the other hand, the almost universal practice of the Church, even between the First Book of Edward and the last review, was to limit the declaration of Absolution to the presbyter; that it was the evident *intention* of the Convocation of 1662 in the last review to limit the Absolution to the presbyter; that the uniform practice, in the English Church, since that time has been in accordance with that interpretation; and finally that, although in the English Book the Rubrics have not been so modified as to effect by law the intention of the Convocation, they *have been* so modified in our Liturgy as to carry out the evident object of its framers; and that hence it is the law of our Church,

confirmed by its uniform practice, that the Declaration of Absolution should be pronounced only by presbyters and Bishops.

X.—SAY AND SING.

1. *Choral Service.*—There is no Canon or Rubric of the English Church, and there are no Injunctions which enforce or permit the use of the Choral Services in Parish Churches, while there are directions that it may or shall be used in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches and in Churches where there had been endowments to establish choirs for this purpose (Butler's Ritualism of Law, pp. 118–21). Nor was it the practice of the English Church, at or subsequent to the Reformation to have Choral Services performed in Parish Churches.

The Choral Service, and the intoning of the Creed and Litany and Psalter in the Cathedrals is usually represented as if it were adopted by the authorities of the Church upon preference and design, and intended to be permanent, whereas there is good authority for believing that it was permitted as a temporary necessity, and that it was designed that the Cathedral service should ultimately be conformed to that of the Parish Churches. This statement is justified by the account given by Bishop Burnet: "The course taken, by Archbishop Cranmer, was, that in all Parish Churches, the service should be read in a plain audible voice, but the former way (the method of intoning and singing) should remain in Cathedrals where there were great choirs who were well acquainted with that tone . . . but this was a thing judged of less importance. It was said that those who had been accustomed to read in that voice could not easily alter it, but as those dropped off and died, others would be put in their places who would officiate in a plainer voice." (Burnet, Hist. of Ref., Vol. 1, p. 360.)

As we have, by law, no other than Parish Churches, and as our Rubrics are in general the same as those of the English in reference to the mode in which the service shall be performed, it follows that no provision or permission for a Choral Service is found in our Liturgy. But, although the practice is without authorization, it has become frequent in the English Church, and occasional in our own, and I believe it has never been called in question before Ecclesiastical Courts, and never been regarded as so objectionable as those Ritual innovations which are connected with the administration of the Lord's Supper. While there are, no doubt, some persons so constituted as to have their devotional feelings best awakened and expressed by a service entirely musical, yet it may well be doubted whether the general adoption of this practice would not turn that which is a wonderful help to devotion, employed in its proper measure, to a hindrance in the case of a vast majority of worshippers, and tend gradually to convert our Churches into musical temples.

2. *Sing and Say.*—While *read* and *say* are used interchangeably in the English service, the word *sing* cannot, as has been sometimes claimed, be regarded as equivalent to either. While all psalms, hymns, and anthems are permitted to be either sung or said, it is required that the prayers shall be *said* and the lessons *read*. When, therefore, a Rubric directs, in one place, that the Priest or Minister shall *say*, and the next Rubric directs that something shall be said *or sung* (as is the case with the Versicles and the Venite) it is manifest that saying and singing are regarded as different things.

The English Book, after the first three Collects of the Morning and Evening Prayer, has the following Rubric: "In choirs and places where they do sing, here followeth the anthem. This Rubric has not until recently been claimed as permitting the anthem to be sung in Parish Churches. It

was interpreted as referring exclusively to Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, and to Churches where choirs were endowed. But it is now generally practised, and furnishes an appropriate change to the else long unbroken series of prayers—longer than in our Liturgy—when it is not rendered, as it frequently is, in highly florid music." (Ritualism of Law, pp. 124–5.)

The parts of the English service, then, which on this interpretation of the Rubrics may legally be *either said or sung*, are the Venite, the Te Deum, the Athanasian, and other creeds, the Easter Anthem, some sentences in the Burial Service, and the Anthem for Ash Wednesday. In practice, and by parity of reasoning, although, without specific direction, all other hymns and canticles are generally sung. In the Ordinal it is directed that the Litany may be said or sung by the Bishops, Priests, and people, but in the Commination Office it is to be said. The *Veni Creator* and other portions of the Ordination Offices may also be said or sung.

3. *The Rubrics of our Liturgy.*—The word *say*, and its equivalent *read*, and the word *sing*, which are thus found to have definite meanings, and not to be interchangeable in the English Book, have the same signification in our Liturgy, where say or read is never used interchangeably with sing. Hence it appears that when the word *sing*, which occurs in the English Book, is omitted in our Liturgy, and only the word *say* or *read* remains, the liberty to sing is taken away, and the obligation to say remains. In accordance with this principle the following results are reached.

(1) The introductory sentences are to be read by the Minister and not sung by the choir. If there be any singing before the Minister reads one of the sentences, it may be one of the Psalms or hymns in metre, set forth by the Church. This will be in strict accordance with the Canon before the selection of Psalms and Hymns, which provides that they may

be sung *before* or after Morning and Evening Prayer. Nor is it unlawful for the choir to sing any sacred anthem approved by the Rector of the Church before the service.

(2) The Psalter is to be read, for immediately after the Preface follows "the order how the Psalter is to be read," and after the Venite the Rubric reads thus—"then shall *follow* a portion of the Psalms," etc., whereas the corresponding English Rubric is, "Then shall be said or *sung* the Psalms as they are appointed."

(3) The Creed and Litany also are to be read. In the English Book the Rubrics before the Creed and Litany are thus expressed: "Then shall be *sung* or said the Apostles' Creed by the Minister and people standing." "Here followeth the Litany or General Supplication to be *sung* or said," etc. In our Book the word *sung* has been stricken out of the Rubric before the Creed; and in the Rubric before the Litany the word *used* is substituted for "sung or said." But another Rubric, after the Prayer for the President, reads thus: "The following prayers are to be omitted here when the Litany is *read*." It appears, therefore, that both the Creed and the Litany are directed by our Rubrics to be said or read, and not sung.

(4) In the Rubrics before the Commandments in the Communion Office the direction is, in the English Book, to the Priest, and, in our Book, to the Minister, that he shall "*rehearse* distinctly," etc., and to the people, that they should *ask* God's mercy. These words imply that the Priest or Minister and people should read or say, not sing, the Commandments and the responses.

(5) The sentences of the Offertory are to be said or read—both expressions being used in the Rubric that precedes and that which follows it, both in the English Book and in our own. The *Ter Sanctus* is to be said or sung, not by the choir or a member of it alone, but by the Priest and people.

The Anthem in the Burial Service of our Church may be said or sung.

(6) In our Communion Office (and in the Scotch Prayer Book, but not in the English) the Rubric directs that after reading of the Epistle, "Here the people shall say, 'Glory be to thee, O Lord!'" When the choir sings the words, it is obvious that the Rubric is not obeyed.

XI.—REMARKS UPON THIS PORTION OF THE SERVICE.

1. The object of the above comments is to show what is the Rubrical law for its use—which is the object, indeed, of the whole of these explanations—and not to determine the degree of exactness or liberty with which the directions may be observed with a good conscience. That is a question which must be decided by the conscience of each individual minister, in view of the history of these services, and under the light of moral principles and the guidance of the Word and Spirit of God. It is certain that the drift of opinion in the Church, among its highest authorities, is in the direction of a larger liberty in the adaptation of the Liturgy to the exigencies of times, and places, and occasions, than was formerly regarded as lawful or expedient; and it is certain, also, that in the exercise of a sober and wise use of that liberty, our services generally have been made more attractive to those that are without, and more edifying to those who are within, our Communion.

2. The portion of the services thus far explained was compiled mainly, as has been stated, from Protestant Manuals of the Continental Churches. Rightly viewed, this fact gives a broader catholicity to our Liturgy than if it were drawn wholly from the ancient Liturgies or the early English Uses. And it is curious to see how the unwillingness of some commentators upon the Prayer Book to admit that it is indebted,

to any considerable degree, to the formularies of the Protestant Churches on the Continent, and especially of the Calvinistic Churches, leads them to some singular statements. Mr. Proctor, in order to show that the ancient Liturgies and the early English Uses were the exclusive models in the minds of the framers of the Liturgy, and that those portions of the service were not taken as a new thing from the Calvinistic formularies, finds something which he thinks is similar to our Confession in the *Capitula* of the old Uses which were read in Lent, and in some of its phrases in a Homily of Pope Leo! This is certainly going far to find a resemblance which is exceedingly vague, especially as large portions of those forms are literal translations of those to which reference has been made. Archbishop Lawrence, in his very valuable Bampton Lectures, states that the declaration in absolution, "that God desireth not the death of a sinner," is contrary to the Calvinistic theory." "And yet it is remarkable," says Blakeney (p. 324), that these *ipsissima verba*, "who desireth not the death of a sinner," were introduced into this form by a Calvinist; the expression in our absolution being the translation of the words, from John Alasco's service, "*neque amplius velis mortem peccatoris, sed potius convertitur, et vivat.*" Proctor admits that Alasco was a Calvinist; and Heylin describes him as a "perfect Calvinist."

XII.—THE AMEN.

The word *Amen* is printed at the end of the Confession in the same type with the Confession itself. But the first Rubric which directs it to be said by the people, at the end of all prayers, occurs after the first Declaration of Absolution. At the end of the second Declaration it is printed in *Italics*. When it is printed in the Roman type it is to be pronounced by minister and people, and when printed in *Italics* it is to

be pronounced by the people alone. (Stephens's Pr. Bk., p. 412.)

XIII.—THE LORD'S PRAYER.

The first Book of Edward, following the early Liturgies and the Mediæval Uses, commenced with this prayer. In the early Church this prayer was used only in the Communion Office after the dismissal of the catechumens. In the Sarum Use, when it began the Matin Service, it was repeated by the Priest alone. It was not until the last review of 1662 that the direction was added that the people should repeat it *with him*, both there and wherever else it is used in divine service. Previous to this it had been said by the Minister alone, whenever it occurred. In the explanation of the Communion Office reasons will be given for the belief that the above rule was not intended to apply to the Lord's Prayer in that service.

The Doxology to the Lord's Prayer was added in 1662, and constitutes the recognition of the received text of Matt. vi. 13, and Luke xi. 4. It was the constant use of the Greek and Gallican Church to add the Doxology to the Lord's Prayer, but it was not used by the Latin Church.

XIV.—THE VERSICLES AND THE GLORIA PATRI.

The first two Versicles are taken from Psalm li. 15. We have omitted the second two ("O God, make speed to save us!" "O Lord, make haste to help us!"). The Rubric directing the congregation to rise, and the Gloria Patri to be said, follows properly the declaration of the forgiveness of our sins. It is an ascription of praise to the Trinity, each person of which has concurred in securing our pardon.

XV.—THE RUBRIC BEFORE THE VENITE.

The English Rubric directs that "the Psalm following" shall be said or sung, except on Easter Day, for which another anthem is appointed; and on the nineteenth day of every month, it is not to be read *here*, but in the ordinary course of the Psalms. Our Rubric calls the Venite an anthem, and directs that it shall be said or sung, except on those days for which *other anthems* are appointed, and except also, on the nineteenth day of the month. The difference between the Rubrics arises from the fact that, besides the anthem for Easter, which is the only one in the English Book, our Book provides anthems also for Christmas, Ash Wednesday, Good Friday, Ascension, and Whitsunday, and Thanksgiving.

XVI.—THE VENITE.

The xcvth Psalm has been in use from a remote period in the Liturgies of the East and West. It has generally been called the Invitatory Psalm. Its perfect adaptation to the purpose of stirring up the hearts of the worshippers to fit prayer and praise is obvious. The last four verses of the Psalm are omitted in our Book, and two verses of the xixth and xiiith Psalms are substituted in their place. This is certainly an improvement, because the omitted verses have a special reference to the Jews, and no peculiar adaptation to the circumstances of the Church of England or of our own Church. In the Proposed Book the anthem stands as it does in the English Book.

XVII.—THE PSALTER.

The Psalter was accustomed to be chaunted entire in monasteries, sometimes in a week, and sometimes in a shorter

period. The arrangement of the English Church and of our own is, that the whole Psalter shall be taken in order every month, and accordingly it is divided into portions for Morning and Evening Prayer, for thirty days. In the early Church (in the fourth century) they were chaunted antiphonally. The version used in the Psalter is the old translation of Tyndale and Coverdale (A. D. 1535), revised by Cranmer (A. D. 1539). The English Rubric directs that at the end of every Psalm throughout the year, and likewise at the end of Benedicite, Benedictus, Magnificat, and Nunc Dimittis, the Gloria Patri *shall* be repeated. Our Rubric directs that at the end of the Venite, Jubilate, Benedicite, Benedictus, Cantate Domino, Bonum est, and all the anthems of the Morning and Evening Prayer, *may* be sung the Gloria Patri, and at the end of the whole portion or selection *shall be* said or sung the Gloria Patri, or else the Gloria in Excelsis.

Our Church has provided as a substitute for the Psalter for the day ten selections, which may be used at discretion, instead of the Psalter.

The Proposed Book, instead of the Psalter entire, made selections from the Psalms, and arranged them into parts—the 1st and 2d—the first to be used in the morning and the second in the evening, or both together at discretion, if there was no Evening Service. This change was due to Bishop White, who did not believe that all the Psalms, or all parts of them, in the order in which they succeed each other, were adapted to the worship of Christian congregations.

XVIII.—THE LESSONS.

In no one point of our Liturgy were greater improvements made than in the selections of Lessons for the Sundays and Holy Days and seasons. The remark is applicable to the Table of Lessons which was in use previous to the new Lectionary, which is now authorized in the Church of England.

An illustration of the superiority of our selection of Lessons to that of the English Church, previous to the introduction of the new Lectionary, is seen in our Table of Lessons for the Advent Season. The English Book designated no second Lessons for this season. The second Lessons for December (which are those which were read on Advent Sundays), are taken—the Morning Lessons from the Acts, and the Evening Lessons from the Epistles to the Hebrews, the Epistle of St. James, and the Epistles of St. Peter, St. John, and St. Jude. These are much less appropriate than our own, which are taken, for the morning, from the first chapters of St. Luke and St. Matthew; and for the evening, from the xth, xiith, and xivth chapters to the Romans, and the 1st chapter of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians—all of which are in special harmony with the season. The same remark is applicable to the selection of Lessons for the season of Lent. A noticeable change in our Lectionary is the omission of many chapters from the Apocrypha. In the English Book there are one hundred and thirty-one Lessons taken from the Apocrypha; whereas in our Book there are but twenty-nine.

The new Lectionary of the Church of England, whose use in our Church was authorized by the General Convention of 1877, is a great improvement upon the old one. It introduces some portions of Scripture—notably from the Revelation of St. John—not hitherto in use, and the permission to use its Lessons has enlarged the area of Scripture from which our clergy can now select Lessons appropriate to special occasions or events. A new Table was appointed for Lent and for Ember-Days and Rogation-Days (to be used at the discretion of the Minister instead of the Lessons elsewhere appointed in the Calendar). This Table, reported by a committee to the General Convention of 1874, but failing of approval in that year, was permitted to be used by the Convention of 1877.

XIX.—THE TE DEUM.

This sublime anthem is very ancient and of doubtful authorship. Some have ascribed it to Ambrose and St. Augustine, others to Ambrose alone, others again to Abondius, Nicetius, Bishop of Triers, or Hilary of Potiers. (Palmer, Origines Liturgicæ, 1, 226.)

The Benedictine Edition of the Works of Hilary claims the authorship for him on grounds that are very plausible. (Palmer, Ibid.) In the Roman Breviary it is called the Canticle of St. Ambrose and Augustine, from the tradition that it was sung by them alternately by inspiration, at the Baptism of the latter. By the Book of 1549 it was ordered to be used daily throughout the year, except in Lent. This exception, however, was omitted in the Second Book.

XX.—THE BENEDICITE OR SONG OF THE THREE CHILDREN.

This is part of the Greek addition to the 3d Chapter of Daniel, and is an expansion of the cxlviiith Psalm. It was used as a hymn in the later Jewish Church, and was commonly sung in the Christian Church of the IVth Century. In 1549 it was ordered to be used during Lent instead of the Te Deum. But in 1552 the Te Deum and the Benedicite were directed to be used at discretion, without being limited to particular seasons. These two Canticles are the only ones, in the Morning and Evening Prayer, which are not taken from the Canonical Scriptures. Our Book has omitted the verse, "O Ananias, Azarius, and Misael," etc., taken from the 1st of Maccabees ii. 59. The Benedicite was wholly omitted in the Proposed Book.

XXI.—THE SECOND LESSON.

The Second Lesson, with a few exceptions for special days, is always taken from the Gospels or the Acts of the Apostles for Morning Prayer, and from the Apostolic Epistles for the Evening Prayer.

XXII.—THE JUBILATE DEO.

The Jubilate, which is second in the English Book, is first in ours. It will happen in the course of reading the daily Lessons in the Calendar, that the chapter containing the song of Zacharias, the *Benedictus* will be read in the Second Lesson. Hence, at the revision in 1552, the 6th Psalm, *Jubilate*, was added, to be used in such cases instead of the Benedictus. The English Rubric provides that the Benedictus shall be said, except when it shall happen to be read in the Chapter for the day, or for the Gospel on St. John the Baptist's Day. Our Book allows either the Jubilate or the Benedictus to be used at discretion.

XXIII.—THE BENEDICTUS.

In a Rubric of the First Book of Edward this is called "A Thanksgiving for the performance of God's promises." Our Book has retained but four of the twelve verses of the Anthem. They are a general expression of praise for God's fulfilment of his promises of a Saviour for the World. The verses which follow, which have been omitted in our Book, are an amplification and specification of the fulfilment of that promise to the Jews in the birth of Christ. All of these verses were retained in the Proposed Book.

XXIV.—THE APOSTLES' CREED.

The Rubric in the English Book is as follows: "Then shall be sung or said the Apostles' Creed, the Minister and people standing." Our Rubric reads, "Then shall be said," etc.

Our Church also declares that any Churches may omit the words, "He descended into hell," or substitute the words, "He went into the place of departed spirits." There has been no authoritative interpretation, by judicial decision, as to whether, by the word "Churches," individual congregations or the Churches of a Diocese, by Conventional action, were intended; nor has there ever been, so far as the writer is informed, any instance in which this substitution has been made by "a Church" or by "Churches."

This Creed is called the Apostles', because it contains the Apostles' Doctrine. Scripture is silent as to the production of any such form by one or all of the Apostles. Dr. Newman, indeed, states that the Creed is delineated and recognized in 2 Tim. i. 13 ("Hold fast the form of sound words," etc.), and that it is quoted in the 1st of Cor. xx. 3 ("I delivered unto you first of all, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins," etc.). But this statement is not generally sanctioned, even by Romish divines. A confession of faith from the candidates for Baptism was required, but it was, as in the case of the Ethiopian Eunuch and the Jailor at Philippi, a simple declaration of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. This, no doubt, was the origin of the Apostles' Creed, which is but the amplification of such a confession. The existence of many Creeds, differing in expression but agreeing in substance, in the Ante-Nicene period proves that the Churches did not receive such a formula of faith from the Apostles as we now call a Creed. It was the prevalence of heresies which made it necessary to introduce more extended and exact definitions.

XXV.—BOWING AT THE NAME OF JESUS.

The English Church has not enjoined that *special* reverence shall be made at the name of Jesus *in the Creed*. Wheatley makes an assertion which seems to imply that she has done so. He says: "When we come to the Second Article in the Creed, the whole congregation makes obeisance, which *the Church expressly enjoins* in the Eighteenth Canon." The whole history of the matter is briefly as follows:—

1. The 52d Injunction of Elizabeth, A. D. 1559, is as follows: "*Whensoever* the name of Jesus shall be in any *lesson*, *sermon*, or *otherwise*, in the Church pronounced, due reverence be made of all persons, young and old, with lowliness of courtesy and uncovering the heads of the mankind, as thereunto doth necessarily belong, and heretofore hath been accustomed." It appears that this regulation, that "*whenever* the name of Jesus was pronounced," etc., was not long or generally obeyed. Hooker, who wrote after the Injunctions were issued, speaks of this, among others, as one of the "harmless ceremonies which no man was constrained to use."

2. The custom which prevailed *after* the Injunction, and previous to the Canon of 1604, mentioned by Wheatley, was that of rendering obeisance chiefly when the name of Jesus occurred in the *Gospels*, and not in the *Creed*. Hooker says: "Now, because the Gospels, which are weekly read to all, historically declare something which our Lord Jesus Christ either spake, did, or said in his own person, it hath been the custom of Christian men, THEN *especially*, in token of greater reverence, to stand, to utter certain words of acclamation, and at the name of Jesus to bow." (Hooker, Eccl. Pol., 1, 353.)

3. The Canon of 1604 is as follows: "When, *in divine service*, the Lord Jesus Christ shall be mentioned, due and lowly reverence shall be done by all persons present, as it

has been accustomed; testifying by their outward ceremonies and gestures their inward humility, Christian resolution, and due acknowledgment that the Lord Jesus Christ, the true Eternal Son of God, is the only Saviour of the World, in whom alone all the mercies, graces, and promises of God to mankind, for this life and the life to come, are fully and wholly comprised." This language of the Canon does not countenance the impression conveyed by Wheatley's statement, that it was specially enjoined that homage should be rendered to the name of Jesus *in the Creed.*

4. After this Canon was passed it appears that its direction that reverence should be made, *wherever*, in the divine service, the name of Jesus occurred, was not observed; and that the custom was, as before, to make reverence where the name of Jesus occurred in the Gospels. A writer whose production was immediately subsequent to the enactment of the Canon [Notes in a Prayer Book in Bishop Cosin's Library], asserts that, "in reading the Holy Gospel, and *never else*, is adoration made at the name of Jesus; for it is only then in its right exaltation, and then men stand in a position to make reverence." ("How shall we conform to the Liturgy?" J. C. Robertson, p. 133.) Again, in 1638, thirty-four years after the passage of the Canon, Bishop Montague asks, in one of his Injunctions and Queries to the Clergy: "Do they (the parishioners) stand also at the reading of the Gospel, and bend or bow, at the glorious, sacred, and sweet name of Jesus, pronounced out of the Gospel read?"

5. It appears then that in the English Church the custom of bowing at the name of Jesus in the Creed, *is enjoined* by no authority, save that which equally enjoins another custom, long disused, though recently revived, viz., that of making lowly reverence whenever the name of Jesus is mentioned in divine service; and that the custom, long after the Canon was passed, was to bow, not when in the Creed the name of

Jesus occurred, but when it occurred in the Gospels; and that, therefore, the custom of limiting the reverence to the name of Jesus in the Creed has no peculiar venerableness from usage, and no support in law.

6. In our Church the practice of bowing at the name of Jesus in the Creed has no authority other than that of custom, which is not universal. As the custom of bowing at the name of Jesus in the service and in sermons had been enjoined in the Church of England, and our own Church did not re-enact the regulation, and as many declined while many continued to adopt the practice of bowing at the name of Jesus *in the Creed*, after the formation of our Book, we may conclude that, while by practice it is our liberty, it is not by law our obligation.

Behavior in the Church.—The essayists of Queen Anne's reign made steady and laudable efforts to shame people out of their indecorous ways in Church. The Spectator constantly reverts to the subject. At one time it is the *starer* that comes in for his reprobation. The starer posts himself upon a cassock, and from this point of eminence impertinently scrutinizes the congregation and puts the ladies to the blush. In another paper he represents the Indian Chief describing his visits to an English Church. There was a tradition, the illustrious visitor says, that the building had been originally designed for devotion, but there was very little trace of this remaining. Certainly there was a man in black, mounted above the rest, and uttering something with a good deal of vehemence. But people were not listening; they were most of them bowing and courtesying to each other. Then there were the gigglers—who laughed if a grave and reverend man who officiated had anything peculiar in his accent or appearance. In the Guardian, although Steele is very indignant at the Examiner having remarked upon the impropriety of a daughter of the Earl of Nottingham (who was mentioned almost by name) amusing herself with knotting in St. James's Chapel during divine service, he reproves just as the Spectator had done the flirting and the jaunty whisperings that went on in the Church. Swift also animadverted upon it; and Young, in one of his early satires in 1727, describes how—

> "Curt'sies to curt'sies then with grace succeed,
> Not one the fair admits but at the Creed."

Hats worn, and Desecration of Communion Tables.—Polwhile remarks that in Truro Church, about the year 1800, he had seen several people sitting with their hats on. This, however, was something wholly exceptional at that date. One of the things which had displeased the people in Wm. III. was this Dutch habit. He so far yielded to their feelings as to uncover during the prayers, but put on his hat again for the sermon. After all, this was a very little matter compared with gross desecrations, such as happened here and there in remote country places during the last ten years of the preceding century. Amongst the Lambeth Archives is a very long letter by Edmund Bowerman, Vicar of Coddington, who gives a curious account of his parish. The people played cards on the Communion Table; and when they met to choose Church Wardens sat with their hats on, smoking and drinking, the clerk gravely saying, with a pipe in his mouth, that such has been the practice for the last sixty years. This was in 1692. In 1693 Queen Mary wrote to Dean Hooper that she had been to Canterbury Cathedral for the Sunday morning service, and in the afternoon went to the parish Church. She heard a very good sermon, but she thought herself in a Dutch Church, for the people stood upon the Communion Table to look at her. (English Church, &c.)

XXVI.—TURNING TO THE EAST.

The custom of turning to the East has no authority in the Rubrics or Canons or Injunctions of the Church of England; and the reasons for the practice, even if it were lawful, are, as Stephens observes, very fanciful, and, as we may add in reference to some of them, puerile and absurd. Wheatley gives as a reason for the custom, that "it is probable from the Scripture that the Majesty and Glory of God is in a peculiar manner in that part of the Heavens." This view is sanctioned by Bingham and Bishop Mant. Another reason is that the Jews always turned their faces to Jerusalem when they prayed; but the Jews living east of Jerusalem must have turned to the West. Proctor says that it is proper because the East is the source of light, and because it is an expressive symbol of the oneness of the faith. The least that can be said of these reasons for this custom, wholly unauthorized in the Church

of England and in our Church, is that they are fanciful. The practice of bowing at the Gloria Patri, and at the ascription, is wholly unauthorized.

XXVII.—THE NICENE CREED.

This Creed is not included in the order for Morning Prayer in the English Book; but is inserted in the Communion Office, and repeated immediately after the Gospel. The use of this Creed in the celebration of the Lord's Supper in the Eastern Church was adopted as a safeguard against heresy. It was brought to its present form in the 2nd Council of Constantinople, A. D. 381, with the exception of the word *filioque*, which was afterwards added in the Western Church in the Council of Bracara, A. D. 411, and that of Toledo, A. D. 589. Besides its enlarged exposition of the consubstantiality of the Son, it developed for the first time the full doctrine of the personality, divinity, and co-equality of the Holy Ghost. Of the Latin Churches, that of Spain first adopted this Creed, and the public use of it, in order to bring the people back to the true faith after the invasion of the Barbarian Arians. The same custom, for the same reason, prevailed in the Gallican Church, in the the time of Charlemagne. Rome, which was free from Arianism, did not adopt the constant use of the Nicene Creed with the *filioque* into her Liturgy until A. D. 1014; and then for the purpose of assimilating the use of Rome to that of Spain.

This Creed is generally used in our Church on the great festivals which commemorate our Saviour's Advent, Crucifixion, Resurrection, and Ascension, and upon Trinity Sunday. In the English Church the Athanasian Creed was directed to be said in the place of the Apostles' Creed upon Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, and Trinity Sunday. Our Church declined to accept the Atha-

nasian Creed, in part because of its minute definitions, and still more because of its damnatory clauses. (Proctor, 228. Blakeney, 358.)

XXVIII.—THE SALUTATIONS, VERSICLES, AND PRAYERS FOLLOWING.

The mutual salutation of the minister and people is very ancient.

Some of the Versicles which follow in the English Book, and the Lord's Prayer, are omitted in our Book.

The Rubric in the English Book provides, that three collects should follow, viz.: First, the collect for the day; second, that for peace; third, that for grace. Our Rubric provides that the collect for the day shall be omitted when the Communion Service is read. Then, in our Book, follow successively the collects for peace, for grace, and the prayer for the President of the United States.

The collect for peace is taken from the Sacramentary of Gelasius (about A. D. 500). The collect for grace is taken from the Sacramentary of Gregory the Great.

The prayer for the President of the United States is modelled after the prayer for the King. The changes made in it, however, are worthy of notice. Instead of the invocation "King of Kings," we have the words "High and Mighty Ruler of the Universe." Instead of the phrase "Grant him in health and wealth long to reign," we have the words "health and prosperity." Instead of the petition "strengthen him that he may vanquish and overcome all his enemies," we have the petition "so replenish him," etc. All these changes are manifest improvements.

In the English Book, immediately after the collect for grace, the Rubric follows: "In Quires and places where they sing, here follows the Anthem."

XXIX.—THE PRAYERS WHICH FOLLOW WHEN THE LITANY IS NOT USED.

The prayer for the clergy and people is preceded in the English Book by the prayer for the King, after which our prayer for the President is constructed, and by a prayer for the Royal Family. The prayer for the clergy and people, in the English Book, commences thus: "Almighty and everlasting God, who alone workest great marvels," which we have changed to the expression "from whom cometh every good and perfect gift." The "prayer for All Conditions of Men" is placed, in the English Book, among "Prayers and Thanksgivings for Several Occasions," but is always used before the two final prayers in the Morning or Evening Service. In the English Book, after the word *estate*, is inserted in brackets the clause, "especially those for whom our prayers are offered," and a note opposite to the clause directs that this is to be said when any desire the prayers of the congregation. The same remarks apply to the Thanksgivings.

XXX.—THE PROPER PLACE AT WHICH OCCASIONAL PRAYERS AND THANKSGIVINGS SHOULD BE SAID.

1. There is a difference of opinion as to whether the occasional prayers should be read before or after the General Thanksgiving. There is also a corresponding difference of practice. The settlement of the question seems at first view to turn upon the point whether or no "The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ," etc., is to be considered as a prayer—for the Rubric directs that these occasional prayers and thanksgivings should be used "before the *two final prayers*." The English Book treats "The Grace," etc. as a prayer; for the Rubric after the prayer for grace directs, "that these five

prayers following are to be read here," and *that* is one of the five that follow. Moreover, its form is that of a prayer, and not of a benediction, as it is in the Epistle.

2. On the other hand, in favor of the custom of reading the prayer before the General Thanksgiving, is the Rubric which follows the first collect for Ash Wednesday. That provides, that "the Litany being ended, shall be said the following prayer, immediately *before* the General Thanksgiving. From this it is inferred that *all* occasional prayers and thanksgivings should occupy the same place, and that this constitutes the Church's interpretation of what is meant by "the two final prayers."

But in answer to this it is replied, that the two former, following the collect for Ash Wednesday, are neither prayers nor thanksgivings—do not correspond to any that are included under that title—but are confessions of sin. It is added that it is in itself more proper, and more in conformity to Liturgical precedents, that a thanksgiving and not a confession should close a service, as appears in the Baptismal and Communion Offices. Moreover, the Rubric in the office for Thanksgiving Day directs, that "*after* the General Thanksgiving shall be said this following." These considerations seem to prove that the directions for confessions of sin on Ash Wednesday were intended to be an exception to the order in which the occasional prayers and thanksgivings, expressly so called, were usually introduced, and that, therefore, the latter were to be used after the General Thanksgiving.

XXXI.—THE PRAYER FOR ALL CONDITIONS OF MEN, THE GENERAL THANKSGIVING, AND THE PRAYER OF ST. CHRYSOSTOM.

In the prayer for all conditions of men, the expression "The good estate of the Catholic Church" was changed into

"Thy Holy Church Universal." The Thanksgiving is unchanged. The Prayer of St. Chrysostom is found in the Liturgies of Chrysostom and Basil, but its authorship is unknown.

XXXII.—THE OCCASIONAL PRAYERS AND THANKSGIVINGS.

1. *Prayers.*—These are entirely modern and English compositions. The prayer for Congress is taken from that for Parliament, and with the exception of the first sentence is the same. It was composed by Archbishop Laud. The expression which occurs in it—"our most religious and gracious King"—has been much censured by persons within and without the Church of England, as very objectionable, because of the obligation to use it in the reign of kings who cannot properly be called religious. The prayers for rain and fair weather are substantially the same as the English. The prayer in the time of dearth and famine has, like the previous prayers, received some slight verbal changes. The English Book has a second form, which was brought to its present shape in 1661, and is omitted in our Book. The prayer in time of war and tumults belongs to the year 1552. Our prayer is the same, with the exception of the words, "abate their pride, assuage their malice, and confound their devices." The prayers for those who are to be admitted to Holy Orders, which are prefaced by the Rubric, "to be used in the weeks preceding the stated times of ordination," are the same as in the English Book. But in the latter the Rubric directs "that it shall be said every day in the Ember-weeks for those who are to be admitted to Holy Orders." These prayers are peculiar to the English Liturgy.

The Ember-days were called the Feast of the four seasons; and the observance of them with fasting and prayer was an act of consecration of the four seasons of the year. Being

occasions of peculiar solemnity, ordinations were held at that time. The particular days were settled, by the Council of Placentia (A. D. 1095), to be Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday after the first Sunday in Lent, after Whitsunday, after the 14th of Sept. (the Feast of the Holy Cross), and the 13th of Dec. (the Feast of St. Lucia). But the English Book directs one of the prayers to be said on every day of the week. The Rubric was changed in our Book, because the condition of our Church and country was such that it would evidently be inconvenient always to limit the time of ordination to the Ember-weeks.

The prayer "in time of great sickness and mortality" is a substitute for that in the English Book with the title "In the time of any common plague or sickness."

The prayer for a sick person is similar to one in the English Office for the Visitation of the Sick, but is very much improved. Our prayer for a sick child is almost identical with that for a sick child in the English Visitation Office.

The prayer for a person or persons going to sea is taken from the English Book, with many changes. In the English Book it is the first of the occasional prayers, which is to be used in connection with the Daily Morning and Evening prayer appointed to be said in the Navy.

The prayer for persons in affliction is not found at all in the English Liturgy, and is taken, together with one for malefactors, from Bishop Jeremy Taylor.

The prayer to be used for the meetings of Convention was composed by Dr. Smith, and is taken almost literally from the concluding paragraphs of the second part of the homily for Whitsunday.

2. *Thanksgivings.*—The thanksgiving of women after childbirth is taken from the Office for the Churching of Women. The forms for rain, fair weather, plenty, peace, deliverance from enemies, for restoring public peace at home, for deliver-

ance from great sickness," etc., are identical with those in the English Book. The two forms for recovery from sickness, and for a safe return from sea, were added to our Book, and are not found in the English Liturgy.

3. *Proposed prayers and thanksgivings.*—The commission of Bishops appointed in 1853 to consider the Memorial of the Rev. Dr. Muhlenberg and other presbyters, offered for consideration a draught of additional prayers and thanksgivings, with these titles:—

A prayer for unity.
" for the increase of the Ministry.
" for missions and missionaries.
" for the young, to be used on occasions of catechizing in the Sunday School.
" for a person exposed to special danger.
" in time of public calamities, dangers, and difficulties.

Thanksgiving for deliverance from any perils.
" for deliverance from public calamities and dangers.
" for the recovery of a sick child.

XXXIII.—THE EVENING PRAYER.

In the Evening Prayer we have substituted *Bonum est Confiteri* and *Benedic anima mea*, for the *Magnificat* and the *Nunc Demittis* in the English Book. We have also omitted the Lord's Prayer after the Creed.

CHAPTER III.

THE LITANY.

A FORM of supplication resembling the Litany, as distinguished from other prayers, exists in the Apostolic Constitutions. It consists of a series of short petitions, for all orders of men, in all circumstances, and the people answer to each, "Lord have mercy;" and the summons, "Let us pray," is frequently introduced.

In the IVth Century the word Litany came to be especially applied to such offices, performed with processions of the clergy and laity. They were peculiarly penetential in their character, and were used in connection with fasting and prayers, upon great emergencies. We have no traces of such prayers in the West before the Vth Century. The appointment of Litanies on fixed days, called Rogation-Days, took place at about the middle of that Century. They were used chiefly for praying for rain and for fair weather.

The English Church, besides celebrating the Rogation-Days, used Litanies during Lent on week days, the invocations being varied on each day of the week. The English Litany was put forth as a separate book by Henry VIII., and intended to be used as a separate office. But by the Injunctions of Edward VI., it was ordered to be said immediately before the high mass. A Rubric in the first Book (A.D. 1549) ordered it to be said on Wednesdays and Fridays. It was then placed after the Communion Office. In 1552 it was placed where it now stands, with the Rubric directing it to be used on Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, and at other seasons when it shall be commanded by the Ordinary. Hence English Bishops often avail themselves of this direction to use the

Litany only on occasions of Confirmation. The direction is omitted in our Book. The Injunctions of Elizabeth (A. D. 1559) direct that weekly, upon Wednesday and Friday, not being Holy Days, the curate, at the accustomed hour of service, shall resort to the Church, and cause warning to be given to the people, by knolling the bell, and say the Litany and prayers. Archbishop Grindal (A. D. 1571) directed the minister "not to pause between the Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the Communion, but to continue to say them together without intermission, to the intent that the people should not go out of the Church during the whole time of service."

It appears, therefore, that the Litany was allowed to be used *alone* on Wednesdays and Fridays, but that on Sundays the three offices were not separated, except for a brief period, and that this custom was reprehended as an irregularity by the highest Ecclesiastical authority as early as 1571, and that from that period the three services (Morning Prayer, Litany, and Ante-Communion) have been blended into one.

The petitions which are now in use are of great antiquity. An Anglo-Saxon Litany of the VIIIth or IXth Century contains a large portion of our present form. There were English versions of the Litany as early as the XIVth Century. This, indeed, is the first part of the service which was publicly used in English.

The first four petitions are called the *Invocations;* those which follow to the petition "By the mystery," etc., are called *Deprecations;* those which follow the petition "that it may please thee to bless," etc., are called *Obsecrations;* the remainder are called *Intercessions.* The first part of the petition included in brackets, the use of which is discretional in our Book, but not in the English, is called the *Lesser Litany.*

1. *Invocations.*—The old Litanies generally commenced

with the form, "Lord, have mercy!" This was omitted in the Litany of Cranmer, of 1544. The words "miserable sinners" were added in the Invocations of the Trinity, and also the words "proceeding from the Father and the Son." In Cranmer's Litany only three clauses of the numerous prayers to the saints were included. They were omitted in the First Book of Edward VI.

2. *Deprecations.*—In the old Litanies these were given commonly in single clauses, each followed by *Libera, Nos, Domine!* Cranmer brought these into groups with great judgment. The last only of the series has been changed, in the English Book, since 1544. It contained the clause, "From the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities." This appeared in the two Books of Edward, but was omitted in that of Elizabeth. The words "rebellion and schism" were inserted at the last revision of the Prayer Book in 1662.

3. *Obsecrations.*—The plea for mercy by the merits of Christ's Passion, etc., is formed from Cranmer's English Litany and that of Herman's Consultation. Separate clauses in Herman's Book are combined into one petition in the English Book.

4. *Intercessions.*—In the Litany of 1544, the clergy were prayed for under the names of Bishops, pastors, and ministers of the Church, which was changed at the last revision to Bishops, priests, and deacons. The prayer for the peace of all nations was then introduced. Many of the clauses in this part of the Litany are taken from that of Herman.

5. *Lesser Litany, Versicles, and Prayers.*—The Lesser Litany is according to the old form of 1544. The response, "Grant us thy peace!" is inserted from Herman's Litany.

The Versicles and Prayer occupy the same position as in the Litany of Herman. The prayer had formed a collect in the Sarum Mass, "*pro tribulatione cordis.*"

6. *The remainder of the Litany.*—The first four versicles that follow the prayer were taken by Cranmer, in 1544, from a Litany sung on Rogation Monday before leaving the choir to form a procession. The versicles which follow the *Gloria Patri* were taken from an occasional portion added to the Litany in time of war.

7. *Changes in our Book.*—The four petitions for the King and Royal Family are changed into one which contains a prayer for all Christian rulers and magistrates. The word *prosperity* is substituted for the word *wealth*. "From fornication and all other deadly sin," has been changed to "all inordinate and sinful affections." "Love and dread thee," has been changed to "love and *fear* thee." "All women laboring of child," was changed to "all women in the perils of childbirth."

CHAPTER IV.

THE ORDER FOR THE ADMINISTRATOIN OF THE LORD'S SUPPER, OR HOLY COMMUNION.

In its earlier Ecclesiastical use the word *Liturgy* was employed to designate the form of service for the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

The Latin Mass was at once set aside at the commencement of the reign of Edward VI., and a Communion for the people in English was substituted for it. The form is nearly the same as that which stands in the present English Book. A General Confession was provided, but private Confession was also allowed.

I.—THE FIRST RUBRIC.

Our first Rubric is the same in substance as the English second. It refers to wrongs committed by which the congregation is offended, and provides that they be repented and amended, and restitution made, before the offending party be received to the Communion. This Rubric contemplates, primarily, *the feelings of the congregation*, and acknowledges their right to demand that unworthy persons shall not be admitted to the Communion.

1. Notwithstanding the language of the Rubric, no one, according to the uniform decisions of Ecclesiastical and civil Courts in England, can be regarded as having *so* "offended the congregation" as that he can be expelled from the Communion, unless he has been convicted by some legal sentence. The Rubric cannot, therefore, be so applied in England as to accomplish its apparent object. It has even been decided by high legal authority that if a man has grievously offended the congregation by notorious evil living, and has even confessed and gloried in his guilt to the Curate, yet if he has been legally acquitted, the Curate is compelled to admit him, if he claims the right to partake, to the Communion. (Stephen's Book of Com. Prayer, Vol. 2, p. 1074. See also *Ibid.*, pp. 1042–82.)

In consequence of the union of the Church and State in England, and the fact that some civil rights could not, until recently, be enjoyed by persons not in full communion with the Established Church, it has come to pass that repulsion from the Communion has been made exceedingly difficult; and that the Courts have been led, in guarding the rights of men as citizens from the capricious or unjust decisions of the clergy, to force upon the Church the necessity of admitting to the Communion many persons who are obviously unworthy. This state of things, which practically nullifies the operation of the

Rubric, is much lamented by pious Ministers of that Church, who yet strenuously uphold the system under which it becomes inevitable. Says Mr. Proctor: "These rules, *implying* an efficient system of corrective discipline, are wisely retained [not for use, but] for *self-reproof*, and as a means of showing what the Church requires in her members, though in practice they have fallen into disuse from the uncertainty of their legal application." The Minister may *admonish* a notorious evil-liver not to come to the Communion, but, unless he has been legally convicted, he cannot be expelled. "The Ecclesiastical rule is, according to the third Rubric, to signify the case of one who will not be admonished to the Bishop and take his advice. The safety of such a step to the individual clergyman consists in this, that the Bishop is the party to institute legal proceedings, which he is bound to do, if the offender is to be expelled from the Communion." (Proctor, p. 339.)

2. As the Rubric stands in our Book, we suppose that it contemplates the case of a person whose notorious evil life, or some criminal act, has been offensive to the congregation; and that upon a representation from them, or a portion of them, he may be suspended, by the Rector, from the Communion. In this case, as in that provided for in the second Rubric, there may be an appeal from the decision of the Rector to the Ordinary.

3. The first Rubric in the English Book requires that persons intending to communicate should signify their names to the Curate at least the day before. The first Rubric of Edward VI., 1549, implied that there was time, between the Morning Prayer and the Communion, for those intending to communicate, to signify their names to the Priest. The Rubric was altered in 1662 to its present form, in which it is provided that those intending to communicate shall signify

their intention to Communicate at least some time the day before. This Rubric was wholly omitted in our Book.

II.—THE SECOND RUBRIC.

This Rubric contemplates the wrongs, or the evil and unforgiving tempers, which the *minister himself perceives*, and provides that in case of variance he shall admit the penitent party, and repel the one that is obstinate. It provides, also, that the case be reported at once to the Ordinary. The English Rubric provides that the offending person shall be dealt with by the Bishop according to the Canon. Our Rubric makes no reference as to the duty of the Bishop to whom the case is referred. But the Canon (Title 11, Can. 12, Sec. 2, § 2) provides that the Bishop shall institute inquiry only in cases where complaint is made to him in writing by the repelled party. Then, unless the Bishop think fit to restore him, on account of the insufficiency of the cause assigned by the Minister, he shall institute an inquiry in accordance with the Canons of the Diocese in which the alleged offence was committed.

III.—THE THIRD RUBRIC.

1. *The Word Table.*—The word *Altar*, which was commonly used in the primitive Church interchangeably with the word *Table*, was also employed in the Rubric in the First Book of Edward, and in other parts of the services. The first Rubric of Edward's Book was as follows: "The Priest standing humbly afore the midst of the Altar," etc. The first part of the Rubric was omitted in the Second Book of Edward, and the word Altar changed into Table in the Rubric, and wherever else the word occurred throughout the service. But that the word in the First Book was used as synonymous with Table,

and not intended to convey the idea of sacrifice, appears from another Rubric, which reads thus: "Then the Priest standing at *God's board* shall begin," etc.

2. *Covering of the Table.*—It was the custom of the primitive Church to use a fair white linen cloth at the celebration of the Eucharist. The English Rubric and Canons, and our Rubric, provide also that at the time of Communion the Table shall have a fair white linen cloth upon it—thus carrying out the idea of a feast, and not of a sacrifice. The English Canon also provides that at all other times, when divine service is to be performed, it is to be covered "with a carpet of silk or other decent stuff, thought meet by the Ordinary of the place, if any question be made of it." We have no regulation as to the covering of the Table when the Communion is not celebrated.

TABLE.—Nothing, it might be imagined, could be more inoffensive than the use of the Sacred Monogram. But there were some at the beginning of the period, both Dissenters and Puritan Churchmen, who looked very suspiciously at it. They ranked it, together with bowing at the name of Jesus, and turning Eastward at the Creed, among Romish proclivities. "What mean," Ambrose Barnes had said towards the close of the previous century, "these rich Altar-cloths with the Jesuit's cypher embossed upon them?" So, also, that worthy man, Ralph Thoresby, had expressed himself troubled to see at Durham, among other "superstitions," richly embroidered I. H. S. upon the high altar. (English Church, etc.,* Vol. 2, p. 429.)

ORNAMENTS ON THE TABLE.—In Charles the First's time the Ritualistic party in the Church of England used sometimes to place upon the Altars of their Churches *crucifixes* and an array of candlesticks. After the Restoration the former were never replaced. The two candles, however, interpreted as symbolical of the divine and human nature of our Lord, were by no means infrequent in the Churches of the last century, espe-

* The full title of the work from which all these extracts are made is "The English Church in the XVIIIth Century," by Charles J. Abbey and John H. Overton.

cially during its earlier years. Nichols, in a Preface of 1710 to Bishop Cosin's Prayer Book, giving a sort of popular explanation of the English order for the use of foreigners, writes thus: "Now the order wherewith this holy rite is celebrated in our Churches is after this manner: First of all, it is enjoined that the Table or the Altar should be covered over with a clean linen cloth or other decent covering; upon which the Holy Bible, the Prayer Book, the paten, and the chalice are to be placed. Two wax candles are to be set on; and the person who celebrates is to be arrayed in a solemn Ecclesiastical habit, *i. e.*, surplice and hood." Mr. Beresford Hope speaks of an old picture in the possession of Westminster Abbey, referred to the beginning of the XVIIIth Century, in which candles are represented burning upon the Altar. This, at all events, was very unusual. Bishop Hoadley, writing against the Ritualistic practices of some congregations, speaks of the *over Altars* and the ever-lighted candles upon them. In Durham Cathedral, which by traditional custom retained throughout the century a higher Ritual in some respects than was to be found elsewhere, the tapers, of which Thoresby speaks, were probably more than two in number.

3. *Position of the Table.*—The Rubric provides that the Table shall stand in the body of the Church or in the Chancel. The English Rubric adds the words "where Morning and Evening Prayer are appointed to be said." It is obvious that this clause should have been omitted, after the place of reading the prayers was changed from the Table to the reading desk. During Edward's and Elizabeth's reign the Tables, in Parish Churches, were often put directly under the reading desk, outside of the chancel. But since then the practice has been almost uniform to place the table within the chancel, and generally against the wall.

Chancel.—Towards the end of the XVIIth Century, and in the reign of Queen Anne, there was some little discussion, in which Bishop Beveridge took part, as to the propriety of retaining or renovating Chancel screens. In Mediæval times these *cancelli*, from which the chancel took its name, had been universal; and a few of them had been put up under the Stuart sovereigns, notwithstanding the offence with which they were regarded by those who looked upon them as one of the hun-

dred points of Popery. Later in the century they ceased to be regarded either with animosity or favor, and where one had been repaired it was left for the most part to stand without further remark.

Lord's Table.—The conditions and decorations of the Lord's Table differed widely, especially in the earlier years of the period, in accordance with the varieties of opinion and feeling in clergymen and in their congregations. For the most part it was insignificantly and meanly furnished and hemmed closely in by the Communion rails. In the beginning of the century it would appear that in the London Churches a great deal of care and cost had been lately expended upon the Altar pieces. In one Church after another Paterson records the attraction of a fine, a beautiful, a stately, a costly Altar piece. Many of them would, however, by no means approve themselves to a more cultivated taste than that which then prevailed. Instead of the Greek marbles and rich baldachino which Wren had intended for the east end of St. Paul's, the authorities substituted imitation marble and fluted pilasters painted with ultramine and veined with gold. The Vicar of Leeds, writing to Ralph Thoresby in 1723, tells him that a pleasing surprise awaits his return. "Our Altar piece is further adorned since you went—three flower pots upon three pedestals upon the wainscot, gilt, and a hovering dove upon the middle one; three cherubs over the middle panel, the middle one gilt; a piece of open carved work beneath, going down toward the middle of the velvet."

The Cross.—Puritan feeling had very unreasonably regarded the Cross with almost as much jealousy as the Crucifix. This idea had in the last century so far gained ground that the Christian emblem was not often to be seen, at all events in the interior of the Churches, and that those who did use it in their Church-yards or Churches were likely to incur a suspicion of Popery. An anonymous assailant of Bishop Butler in 1667, fifteen years after the death of that Prelate, made a special charge against him that he had put up the Popish insignia of the Cross in his Chapel of Bristol.

Paintings in the Churches.—Sir Christopher Wren had intended to adorn the dome of St. Paul's with figures of sacred history worked in Mosaic by Italian artists. He was overruled; it was thought to be tedious and expensive. But there were some who entertained the hope that some such embellishment was postponed only, not abandoned. Walter Harte, for example, the Non-Juror, in his poem upon painting, trusted that the "cold North" would not always remain insensible to

the claims of religious art. The time would yet come when we should see in our Churches—

"Above, around, the pictured saints appear,"

and when especially the Metropolitan Cathedral would be radiant with the pictorial glory which befitted it.

"Thy dome, O Paul, which heavenly views adorn,
Shall guide the hands of painters yet unborn;
Each melting stroke shall foreign eyes engage,
And shine unrivalled through a future age."

In 1773 Sir Joshua Reynolds proposed that St. Paul's should be adorned with pictures (not frescoes or mosaics). Application was accordingly made to the Dean and Chapter, who were pleased with the offer. Dean Newton, Bishop of Bristol, a great lover of pictures, was particularly favorable to the scheme and warmly advocated it. Sir Joshua promised the Nativity; West offered his picture of Moses with the Laws: Barry, Dance, Cipriana, and Angelica Kauffman engaged to present other paintings; and four other artists were added to the number. But the Trustees of the building, Cornwallis and Terrick of London, disapproved. Terrick was especially hostile to the idea, and when the Dean waited upon him, and told him with some exultation of the progress that had been made, put an absolute veto upon the whole project. "My good Lord of Bristol," he said, "I have been already distantly and imperfectly informed of such an affair having been in contemplation; but as the sole power remains at last with myself, I therefore inform your Lordship that while I live and have the power I will never suffer the doors of the Metropolitan Church to be opened for the introduction of Popery in it."

4. *Position of the Minister.*—Our Rubric reads: "The *Minister* standing at the *right* side of the table." The English Rubric reads: "The *Priest* standing at the *north* side," etc. This change of the word *north* to *right* was adopted because, neither in our country, nor at this time in England, as formerly, are Churches always built with their chancels to the East. The north side being, where Churches were constructed with chancels to the east, the *right* side, it is the custom in the English Church, in whatever position Churches are placed, to stand at the right side of the table. Wheatley observes that Bishop Beveridge has shown, that when in

ancient Liturgies the Minister is directed to stand *before* the Altar, the north side of it is always meant."

5. *Attitude of Minister and People.*—The Rubric directs that the Lord's Prayer if not said previously in the Morning Prayer, and the Collect shall be said by the Minister standing and the people kneeling. The Rubrics in the Communion Office, not being perfectly explicit in reference to the attitude to be taken by the people, and much diversity ensuing from this cause, the House of Bishops in the Convention of 1832 was led to express its opinion upon this subject. It was as follows:—

Attitude of the Minister.—The standing posture should be observed by the officiating clergyman, when that of kneeling is not expressly prescribed; viz., in all parts, including the Ante-Communion and the Post-Communion, except the Confession, and the Prayer immediately preceding the Prayer of Consecration.

Attitude of the People.—The people should kneel during the prayer and other acts of worship, except in the *Gloria in Excelsis*, when standing is required by the Rubric; and also, by analogy with other directions, when singing the hymn. *Kneeling* is the posture in which the final blessing should be received. The two Exhortations should be heard by the people standing. The postures therefore recommended by the Bishop are—

Kneeling during the whole of the Ante-Communion, except the Epistle, which is to be heard in the usual posture for hearing the Scriptures, and the Gospel, which is to be heard standing.

Sitting when the Offertory is read, as the most favorable posture for handing the alms to those appointed to collect them.

Kneeling during the prayer for the Church Militant.

Standing during the exhortation.

Kneeling resumed and continued until after the Prayer of Consecration.

Standing at the singing of the hymn and the *Gloria in Excelsis.*

Kneeling when receiving the elements, and also in receiving the final benediction.

Postures.—If a modern Churchman could be carried back to the days of Queen Anne, and were at Church while service were going on, his eye would probably be caught by people standing up where he had been accustomed to see them sitting, and sitting down when in our congregations every one would be standing. Some people, following the custom of the Puritans, stood during the prayers. Some, on the other hand, sat during the Creed. In both these cases there was a plain neglect of the Rubric. When the Prayer Book was silent, uncertainty and variation of usage was more reasonable. Thus some stood at the Epistle as well as the Gospel, and some whenever the Second Lesson was from any of the Evangelists. In pictures of Church interiors of that date the people are represented as really kneeling during the prayers. Sitting while the Psalms were being sung was, notwithstanding many remonstrances, the rule rather than the exception during the early part of the century. The Puritan Commission of 1641 had spoken of standing at the hymns as an innovation. Even Sherlock, in 1681, speaks of the universal practice of sitting while we sing the Psalms.

Irregularities in Performance of the Services.—At the close of the century we find South and others bitterly complaining of the liberties taken with the services by some of the moderate clergy. Some prayers, it seems, were omitted and some shortened, and in one form or another the divine service so curtailed, says South in his exaggerated way, as if the people were to have but a tenth from the priest for the tenths he had received from them. No doubt the expectation of immediate changes in the Liturgy, and the knowledge that some of the Bishops were leaders in the movement, had an unsettling effect adapted to encourage irregularities. At all events, we hear little more of it when the agitation in favor of comprehension had ceased. There was a lax observance of the Rubrics, but there appear to be no complaints of serious omissions until three or four of the Arian or Semi-Arian clergy ventured, not only to leave out the Athanasian Creed, but to alter the Doxologies and to pass over the second and third petitions of the Litany.

IV.—THE LORD'S PRAYER.

The question has been discussed whether the Lord's Prayer should be said by the Minister alone, or whether the people should repeat it after him, according to the Rubric before the Lord's Prayer in the Morning Prayer, which provides for its repetition there, and "wherever else it is used in Divine Service." This Rubric, however, is copied from the English Book, in which the Lord's Prayer occurs several times in the "Divine Service;" which, by the advocates of the former opinion, is believed to refer to the Morning and Evening Prayer and Litany, and not to the occasional offices. If this interpretation be well founded, as I think it is, then the following reasons may be urged, with the more force, for its repetition by the Minister *alone*.

1. The historical argument is in favor of this interpretation. The injunction of King Edward VI. (1547) was as follows: Every day throughout the year the Priests shall, immediately after the Gospel, openly and plainly *recite* to their parishioners, in the pulpit, the Pater Noster, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments. The word *recite* applies to all the three forms; and the fact that the Ten Commandments are not repeated by the people, leads to the same conclusion in the case of the Lord's Prayer.

To the same effect is the Rubric of Elizabeth, that the Minister "should say the Lord's Prayer *with the Collect* following." The inference is, that, as the Collect was to be said by the Minister *alone*, so also was the Lord's Prayer.

2. The Lord's Prayer at the close of the Communion Office directs that the people shall repeat after the Minister every petition, a direction which would be unnecessary if it were intended to be included under the Rubric in the Morning Prayer, and if it were designed to have it repeated in the

same manner as when it occurs here at the commencement of the office.

3. The attitude—*standing*—is that usually assumed when any service or form is to be said by the Minister alone.

4. The custom which prevails in the English Church, and until the year 1835 prevailed in our Church also, of the repetition by the Minister *alone* of a Collect and the Lord's Prayer previous to the sermon, proves that the Lord's Prayer may sometimes be lawfully said by the Minister alone, notwithstanding the Rubric which enjoins the repetition of it by the people *whenever* it is said in *divine service.*

Rubrical authorities are divided upon the subject, and the question is not important, inasmuch as the Lord's Prayer will have already been previously used on almost all occasions of the public celebration of the Communion.

V.—THE COLLECT.

This Collect for purity is very old in the Western Church, and is similar to that used in the Eastern Churches, which was this: "O Lord, purify our souls and bodies from all pollutions of the flesh and the spirit." Its propriety, and its harmony with the exhortation appointed for the previous Sunday, is obvious.

VI.—THE COMMANDMENTS.

The Ten Commandments were not placed in the first Liturgy of 1549, but were introduced into the second in 1552, from the Strasburg Liturgy, introduced by Pollanus, in London, in 1551. Nor are they found in the Communion Offices of the ancient Church, or of the Roman Church. Yet they are, with great propriety, placed in the forefront of a Sacrament in which we renew our consecration to God, and

profess to repent of all violations of His laws, and to take upon ourselves new vows to have respect to all His Commandments.

Our Prayer Book has, after the Commandments, our Lord's summary of the law (Matt. xxii. 37–40), followed by the Collect—"O Almighty and Everlasting God," etc. This summary of the Commandments is not in the English Book; but the Collect is the one which stands second at the close of the English Communion Office.

VII.—THE COLLECT AND THE RUBRIC FOLLOWING.

In the English Book there follows a prayer for the Queen. We have substituted the present Collect in its place. The Rubric directs the mode and attitude in which the Epistle and Gospel should be read and heard. Before the Gospel is read, our Rubric directs that here the people shall say, "Glory be to thee, O Lord!" The English Church has omitted the Rubric, which was in the following form in the First Book of Edward VI.: viz., "The clerks and the people shall answer: Glory be to thee, O Lord!" She has, however, retained the practice.

VIII.—COLLECTS, EPISTLES, AND GOSPELS.

1. *Introits.*—The First Book of Edward VI. was entitled, "The Introits, Collects, Epistles, and Gospels to be used at the celebration of the Lord's Supper and Holy Communion throughout the year, with the proper Psalms and Lessons for divers feasts and days." An Introit, or short Psalm, or fragment of a Psalm, to be sung at or before the commencement of the Communion Office, was prefixed to each Collect. These were removed on the revision of 1552.

2. *The Ecclesiastical Year.*—The ecclesiastical year is divided into two parts: the first, from Advent to Trinity

Sunday, is designed to commemorate the life of Christ on earth, and the principal events of his life are celebrated in their order, the Incarnation, Nativity, Circumcision, Manifestation to the Gentiles, His Baptism, Fasting and Temptation, His Agony, His Death, Burial, Resurrection, Ascension, and the Mission of the Holy Ghost. The object of the Epistles and Gospels during this time is to remind us of the benefits which we receive from God the Father, through the mediation and atonement of Christ, and the ministration of the Holy Ghost. In the second part of the year, from Trinity to Advent, the portions of Scripture are selected with a view to instruct us in the truths of the Gospel, and to teach us to conform our lives to the precepts and practice of our blessed Lord.

3. *The Collects.*—The Collect may be defined to be a prayer for grace and blessing, in connection with the Epistle or Gospel for the day, or with both of them. It is a form peculiar to the Western Church. The greater number of the Collects were translated from those in the Missals of the English Church. Many of them exist in the Sacramentary of Gregory the Great, and therefore date as early, at least, as A. D. 590; some are found in the Sacramentary of Gelasius (A. D. 490); and some may be traced to that of Leo (A. D. 483). By consulting the Table of Collects in Proctor (p. 266–8) it will be seen that the new Collects are but twenty-five, while the number retained from the ancient forms is fifty-four, and the number altered is thirteen.

4. *Epistles.*—The custom of reading an Epistle, or a portion of an Epistle, at this place was practised in the primitive Church. It was formerly called the Apostle. By the Injunction of Edward VI. it was to be read in the pulpit, or some convenient place; and by the Injunction of Queen Elizabeth it was to be read in Cathedral and College Churches by a special reader called the Epistler, who was to be habited in a cope.

Almost all of the present Epistles appear in the Liturgies of the English Church before the invasion of William the Conqueror. They are generally devotional and practical, rather than doctrinal.

5. *Gospels.*—Immediately before the Gospel is read it is the custom of the Church of England and of our own Church for the choir to sing, or the congregation to say, "Glory be to thee, O Lord!" It is the only part of the English service which is universally practised without being prescribed. This custom prevailed in the East and West. The Liturgy of the Episcopal Church of Scotland and our Liturgy retain it as part of the prescribed service.

The portions of Scripture appointed for the Gospels are the same, for the most part, that have been used in the Church of England for nearly twelve hundred years.

The use and position of the Epistle and Gospel immediately before the sermon constitute an expressive recognition of the source whence the teachings of the sermon are expected to be drawn. It was the ancient custom almost uniformly to make the sermon an exposition of the whole or part of the Epistle or Gospel for the day, or both. The custom was very general among the Reformers of the Church of England and the Continental Churches, and still prevails largely in the latter.

IX.—THE THREE RUBRICS BEFORE THE OFFERTORY.

1. The first Rubric provides that the Apostles' or Nicene Creed shall here be read (*i. e.*, after the Gospel), unless one of them shall have been read before in the Morning Service. In the English Book the Rubric directs that the Nicene Creed—which is never read in their Morning Prayer—shall here be said or sung.

2. The next Rubric directs that notice shall be given of what Holy Days or Fasting Days are in the week following to be observed, and also of the Communion when it is to be

administered, and of the bans of Matrimony, and of other matters. The English Rubric further declares that nothing shall be proclaimed or published in the Church, during the time of Divine Service, but by the Minister; nor by him anything but what is prescribed by the rules of this Book, or enjoined by the Queen or by the Ordinary of the place. There is no such limitation with regard to what notices shall be given in our Book. The language of the Rubric is: "Shall notice be given of the Communion and of the bans of Matrimony, and *other matters to be published*." It appears that the phraseology of the Rubric is thus general, in order to allow each Rector to give such notices as he may judge to be proper and expedient.

From the language of the Rubric, "then shall the Minister declare unto the people *what* Holy Days or Fasting Days are in the week following *to be observed*," it has been inferred that our Rubric enjoins that *all* such days in the Calendar are directed to be observed. But a reference to the first Rubric, and to the change which was subsequently made in it, proves that in the English Church—and, therefore, as our Rubric is the same, in our Church also—it was not only not intended to enforce the *observance* of all the Holy Days in the Calendar, but that it was not designed that all the Holy Days in the Calendar which will occur during the week following should be *announced*, but only those which the Minister himself intends to *observe*. Wheatley, indeed, and Bishop Mant declare that the Rubric directs the Curate to announce what Holy Days will *happen* during the week. But the Rubric originally directed the Curate to announce "*whether there be* any Holy Days or Fasting Days during the week following," whereas the direction now is that the Curate or Minister is to announce what Holy Days or Fasting Days "*are to be observed*." If it had been intended that all the Holy Days of the Calendar were to be announced, this

change in the Rubric would not have been made, for its effect is to defeat that object.

3. The second Rubric also directs that, "if occasion be, shall notice be given of the Communion." And, at the same time, it is directed by the Rubric which precedes the first Exhortation, that, "when the Minister giveth warning of the celebration of the Holy Communion (which he shall always do upon the Sunday or some Holy Day immediately preceding), he shall read this exhortation following, or so much thereof as in his discretion he may think convenient." The English Rubric does not, like ours, leave it discretional with the Minister to read only a portion of the exhortation.

Prayer before the Sermon.—In Queen Anne's time there was no part of the service in which the High and Low Church tone of the congregation was more clearly betokened than when the preacher had just entered the pulpit. In the one case the bidding prayer was said; in the other there was an extempore prayer, often of considerable length, commonly called the pulpit prayer. The bidding prayer had its origin in pre-Reformation times. "The way was for the preacher first to name and open his text, and then call on the people to go to their prayers, and to tell them what to pray for; after which all the people said their beads in a general silence, and the preacher also kneeled down and said his."* It was thus not a prayer, but an exhortation to prayer, an exhortation in the points commended to private but united worship. In Henry VIII.'s time the Pope's name was omitted, and prayer for the King under his proper titles was strictly enjoined. In Elizabeth's reign also praise for all who had departed in God's faith was substituted for prayer in their behalf.† By the existing canons as agreed upon in 1603, preachers were instructed to move the people to join with them in prayer before the sermon, either in the bidding form or to that effect as briefly or conveniently they may. It was, however, no longer clear whether it were itself a prayer, or as in former times an admonition to pray. On the one hand, it was called a form of prayer, and was followed without pause by the Lord's Prayer and then by the sermon. On the other hand, it was prefaced not by the familiar "Let us pray,"

* Burnet. † Wheatley.

but by the old bidding, "Ye shall pray," or "pray ye," and the congregation stood as listeners until the Lord's Prayer began. Hence a difference in practice arose, curiously characteristic of the controversies, ecclesiastical and political, which were being agitated at the end of the XVIIth and the beginning of the XVIIIth century. In Charles I.'s reign many had chosen to consider it a prayer; and, taking advantage of the permission to vary it, had converted it into one of those extempore effusions which Puritan feeling considered so peculiarly edifying. It need hardly be added that the Anglicans were more than ever careful to adhere to the older usage. * * * The use, however, of extempore prayer in this part of the service was defined by some of the Clergy and Bishops as agreeable to the people, as conformable to the custom of the Reformed Churches abroad, and attractive to those among the Presbyterians and other denominations who only needed encouragement and a few slight concessions to exchange occasional for constant uniformity.

Curiously enough, when Geo. I. came to the throne the political gloss attached to the bidding became reversed. In the Royal direction to the Archbishop, the Canonical form, with the Royal titles included, was strictly enjoined; and consequently not those who used, but those who neglected it, ran a risk of being set down as having Jacobite proclivities. It had, however, never been really popular, and few objected to its gradual disuse. Ever since the Revolution it had introduced into a portion of the public worship far too decided an element of political feeling. The objection was the greater because the liberty of variation had given it a certain personal character. If the preacher did not keep strictly to the words of the Canon, he could scarcely avoid making it appear, by the names omitted or inserted, what might be his political, his Ecclesiastical, or his academical opinions. Those again whose respect for dignities was in excess—a foible to which the age was prone—would go through a list of titles, Rt. Rev., Rt. Hon., and Illustrious, which ill accorded with a time of prayer. Before the middle of the century, except in University Churches, or on formal occasions, the Canon became generally obsolete, and the sermon was prefaced as *often* (?) in our own day by a Collect and the Lord's Prayer.

Our Rubric before the Exhortation has been so changed from the English form as to avoid an apparent, if not a real discrepancy. The Rubric before the Offertory directs that notice of the Communion should be given *before* the sermon.

The Rubric before the exhortation as it stands in the English Book is as follows: "When the Minister giveth warning, etc., *after* the sermon or homily ended, he shall read this exhortation following." Wheatley concludes his discussion of the difficulty with expressing his conviction, that "the intent of the revisers was that, when there was nothing in the sermon itself preparatory to the Communion, both this and the other Rubric should be complied with, viz., by giving warning in this place (*i. e.*, before the sermon), that there will be a Communion on such a day, and then reading the exhortation after the sermon is ended." (Stephen's Pr. Bk., p. 1051.)

The giving notice of the bans of Matrimony is practised only when required by the laws of the State.

4. The next Rubric directs that the sermon shall then follow. The English Book adds, "or one of the homilies." There is no direction here that a hymn shall be sung before the sermon, but before the Psalms and hymns there is inserted the action of the General Convention, to the effect that the Psalms in metre, with the hymns, are set forth, and *allowed* to be sung before the Morning and Evening Prayer, and also before and after sermons, at the discretion of the Minister." The practice of singing a hymn is universal.

5. The clause, "or one of the homilies," has been omitted in our Book, because (Article XXXV.) the reading of the homilies in the Churches was suspended until a revision of them could be made, "for the clearing of them as well from obsolete words and phrases as from local references." Such revision has never been made.

The direction that there *shall* then follow the sermon is peremptory. The authority of the English Ritualists to this effect is uniform (Stephens, 1155–60). The custom, therefore, of an early Communion before the Morning Prayer, and

without the sermon, is destitute of authority—indeed, is directly in conflict with the Rubrics of the Communion Office.

The Pulpit.—The great three-decked pulpit of the Georgean era is still familiar to our memories. To the next generation it will be at length a curiosity of the past. Nor must the mighty sounding board be forgotten, impending with almost threatening bulk over the preacher's head, and adorned with the emblematic symbol of grace—the dove. The pulpit had supplanted the old box desk of the Reformation, and had maintained itself in undiminished honor through all the subsequent changes. In rich London parishes much rare workmanship was often expended upon it. If not by its costliness, at least by its dimensions, it was apt to throw all other Church furniture into the shade.

During the earlier part of the century an hour glass, in a wood or iron frame, was still not an infrequent appendage of the pulpit. In the Elizabethan period they had been general. But perhaps the Puritan preachers had not cared to be reminded that preaching had its limits; or a later generation, on the other hand, might have dreaded the suggestion that the sermon might last an hour. At all events, as they wore out they were not replaced; and Bishop Kennett, writing in the third decade of the century, spoke of them as already beginning to be uncommon.

The custom, in the English Church, of the Minister to repeat a Collect and the Lord's Prayer before the sermon, although universal, is without authority. It is, indeed, reprehended by eminent English rubricians as illegal (Stephens, 1157–59); and its omission was recommended by the joint resolution of the House of Bishops and the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, in 1835.

6. After the sermon, the minister is directed, *when there is a Communion*, to return to the Lord's Table, and begin the Offertory. The direction implies that the Minister *had been* at the table, performing the Ante-Communion service, previous to the sermon. But it does not imply that, in case there be no Communion, the Minister must return to the Lord's Table and there conclude the service with prayer and the benediction. This is implied, as Bishop Mant proves, in

the English Service; for a Rubric, which we have changed, at the end of the Communion Office, provides that upon Sundays and Holy Days, when there is no Communion, "shall be said all that is appointed unto the end of the General Prayer for the whole estate of Christ's Church Militant." This includes the reading of the Offertory, which is directed to be read at the Communion Table. When there is no Communion, it is usual in the English Church, for the Minister to read only one or two of the sentences, and then to pass on immediately to the prayer for the Church Militant, and close with one or more Collects and the benediction.

X.—THE OFFERTORY.

The last Rubric directs, that when there is a Communion, the Minister shall return to the Lord's Table and begin the Offertory.

The Offertory was not limited to money, either in the primitive Church or in the Church of the Reformation. Bread, wine, corn, and other gifts for the poor were often presented. These offerings were divided, in the primitive Church, into four portions. One of these was for the clergy. We find, from the Books of Edward and that of Elizabeth, that the custom of making offerings for the support of the clergy prevailed at that time. This appears from the Rubric that, "at the offering days appointed, every man and woman shall pay to the Curate the due and accustomed offerings." The sentences selected to be read enforce the duty of charity to the poor, and also (with reference, no doubt, to the offerings to be made to the clergy) of the support of the clergy. That the offerings at Communion were not intended to be limited to the use of the poor appears also from the fact, that at the last review, the Rubric was changed from the words "the devotions of the people," to the words "the alms for the poor

and other devotions of the people." Hence there need be no scruple to embrace other objects than the poor in the offerings made at the Communion, and hence also appears the propriety as well as lawfulness of using the Offertory when collections are made at other times than when the Communion is celebrated.

Offertory Neglected.—Even in Bishop Bull's time the Offertory was very much neglected in country places. Later in the century its disuse became more general. There were only one or two parishes in his diocese, Secker said, where the old custom was retained of oblations for the support of the Church and alms for the poor. But often there was no Offertory at all; he hoped it might be revived and duly ministered.

XI.—THE RUBRICS WHICH FOLLOW.

1. The Rubric mentions first the deacons as those whose duty it is to collect the alms. The Scotch Liturgy allows the wardens to do it only when there are no deacons present. But the custom in the English Church, and in our own, is almost universal to have the alms collected by the wardens and vestrymen even when deacons are present. The earlier Books provided that the alms should be put in the poor man's box. The last review provided that they should be placed in a decent basin. The direction that it shall be reverently brought and humbly presented and placed upon the Holy Table, was introduced at the review of 1662. The Rubric (although its language is somewhat confused) appears to have contemplated that the collection should be made by one person and in one basin, by its use of the expressions, "other fit person," and *a* decent basin, and *it;* but for the sake of saving time, several persons with each a basin, usually make the collection, and all of them together, or each singly, are then placed upon the Table. Some clergymen have recently adopted the custom of receiving into one large basin the contents of each of the basins as they are presented, and

placing the whole offering in it upon the table, as best fulfilling the direction of the Rubric, that they should "humbly present and place *it* upon the Holy Table." This custom has long prevailed in the Temple Church, London.

2. The next Rubric provides that "the priest shall then place upon the table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient." The custom, therefore, of having them placed upon the table by the sexton before the commencement of the Morning Prayer is not according to the Rubric: but it has been so uniform in our Church as to be lawful, if not unwritten law. The difficulty of obeying the Rubric literally arises from the fact that no mention is made of the place in which the elements should be put previous to being removed to the table. A side table or *Credentia* was not authorized in the Church of England, and not provided for by the Rubrics of any of the books. Such a table has indeed been pronounced unlawful by the Court of Arches, in the case of *Faulkner* v. *Litchfield and Stearne* (Stephen's Pr. Bk. 1173). In the Second Book of Edward this Rubric was thrown out, but restored at the last review. It is difficult to see what objection lies against a side table, or niche, on which the elements may be placed before the commencement of the communion service.

Credence Table.—The credence or side table upon which the Sacramental elements are placed previously to being offered, in accordance with the Rubric, upon the Lord's Table, had been objected to by many Puritan Churchmen. Provision was rarely made for this in the XVIIIth century Churches. It is mentioned as somewhat exceptional on the part of Bishop Bull that he always offered the elements himself upon the Communion Table before beginning the service.

3. In the First Book of Edward VI. the bread was ordered to be unleavened and round, as it was before, but "without all manner of print" and larger than before, so that it may be divided into two pieces at least. In the second Book it was

provided that ordinary bread should be used, the purest white bread that could conveniently be procured. But Elizabeth's Injunction (A.D. 1559) ordered that the bread be common fine bread of the fashion of what were called "singing cakes" used in private masses. Archbishop Parker explains that when such bread cannot easily be obtained, or superstition be feared from the wafer bread, then common bread may be used. Hooker states that wafer bread was commonly used unto the end of Elizabeth's reign. Since then the common wheat bread has been, until recently in some high Ritualistic Churches, uniformly used.

4. The First Book of Edward directed that a little clean and pure water should be added to the wine. This direction was withdrawn in the next Book. It is the custom of the Greek Church, and was one of the usages of the Non-Jurors; but it has been recently condemned by several decisions of the Judicial committee of the Privy Council.

Connected with the question of the form of the Communion bread, there have also arisen questions as to the times and circumstances in which it is most reverent and proper to be taken. The practice urged as a matter of conscience, of what is called *fasting communion*, is thus severely dealt with by the late Bishop Wilberforce in an address delivered to the Rural Deans of his Diocese but three days before his death.

"It is not in a light sense that I say this new doctrine of Fasting Communion is dangerous. The practice is not advocated because a man comes in a clearer spirit, and less disturbed body and mind, able to give himself entirely to prayer and communion with God; but on a miserable degraded notion that the consecrated elements will meet with other food in his stomach. It is a detestable materialism. Philosophically it is a contradiction, because when the celebration is over, you may hurry away to a meal and the process about which you are so scrupulous immediately follows. The whole notion is simply disgusting. The Patristic quotations by which the custom is supported are misquotations. St. Chrysostom's saying on the subject applies to the full mid-day meal, not to the light repast of an ordinary breakfast. It is put on the moral

grounds that after a feast, there will be fulness, and that during a feast there will be jesting and talking, all of which constitutes a moral unfitness for so high a ceremonial." (Bishop Wilberforce, London Quarterly, January, 1880, p. 118.)

XII.—PRAYER FOR CHRIST'S CHURCH MILITANT.

In the First Book of Edward this formed part of the prayer of the Consecration of the Elements, but since 1552 it has occupied its present position. The introduction originally stood thus, "Let us pray for Christ's Church." The words "militant upon Earth" were added at Bucer's suggestion, that the words seemed to sanction prayers for the dead. The words "upon Earth" were omitted in our Book as superfluous. The commendation in the prayer to the mercy of God, of those who were departed, as also praise for the virtues and graces of Mary, were omitted.

XIII.—EXHORTATION ON THE SUNDAY OR HOLY DAY PRECEDING THE COMMUNION.

The Rubric directs that the Minister shall read the whole, or so much as, in his discretion, he may think convenient, of this Exhortation. This and the following Exhortation have passed through many changes in their arrangement. The second Exhortation, to be used in case the Minister see the people negligent to come to the Holy Communion, was composed by Peter Martyr at the instance of Bucer. They both belong to the Reformed period, and are not found in the ancient Liturgies. The first is found in Herman's Consultation. Until 1662 they were used at the time of the actual celebration of the Communion. The phrase, "therefore if any of you be a blasphemer," etc., was introduced into the first Exhortation when it became a preliminary notice of Communion, in 1662.

XIV.—EXHORTATION AT THE CELEBRATION OF THE COMMUNION.

This Exhortation also was peculiar to the Reformed Offices. It was intended to instruct the people in the meaning of the Communion, and to warn them against previous errors.

The English Rubric has this clause, which we have omitted, "The Communicants being conveniently placed for the receiving of the Holy Sacrament, the priest shall say," etc. This refers to the old custom of the Communicants coming to the choir or Chancel, in order to be ready to take their places at the Chancel rail. The question has been raised whether non-communicants have a right to remain at the celebration. In the English Church, until A. D. 1662, it is evident that they were not *expected* to remain. The First Book of Edward requires them to leave the choir. The XXVth Article and the Homily of the Sacrament declare that the Sacrament is not to be gazed upon or carried about; and the Exhortations from 1552 to 1662 pronounce that it is less blameworthy to depart from the Church than to remain without communicating. Our Church has expressed no opinion and made no rule upon the subject.

Our Book has omitted several expressions in this Exhortation; *e. g.*, "For then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood, etc.; we are guilty of the body and blood of Christ; we eat and drink our own damnation; we provoke God to plague us with divers diseases and sundry kinds of death." In the two Liturgies of Edward warning is given that the devil be not allowed to enter into the communicants, "as he did into Judas." This was transferred to the first Exhortation in 1662, and remains in the English Book, but is omitted in ours.

XV.—THE INVITATION AND CONFESSION.

The Invitation dates from the First Book, and is unchanged in form and language. The Confession is taken, slightly altered, from the Consultation of Herman. Before the Reformation, the priest and the people confessed separately; but our service unites the confessions. The English Rubric differs from ours. Ours directs that the confession shall be said *by* the priest *and* all those who are minded to receive. The English Rubric directs that it is to be said *in the name* of all those minded to receive, by *one* of the Ministers. The Rubric of 1549 directed that it should be said by one of them, *i. e.*, "by one of the people, or else by one of the ministers, or by the priest himself." The Rubric, as it now stands, was introduced at the last review.

XVI.—THE ABSOLUTION AND THE COMFORTABLE WORDS.

These are taken, slightly altered, from Herman's Consultation. The comfortable words are Scriptural statements of the readiness of God to forgive, and of the grounds upon which forgiveness is extended.

XVII.—SURSUM CORDA AND TER SANCTUS.

These have been in use from a very early period, being found in the Liturgies of the East and West. The proper prefaces for the five great festivals are retained out of ten, which occurred in the Romish and English Missals. The direction that the prefaces should be used seven days after each festival does not suppose, as some argue, a daily service *enjoined*, but only *provided for*. The portion of the service which commences with *Sursum Corda* was called the *Canon*. The Rubric provides that the *Ter Sanctus* shall be said or

sung by the priest and people. The English Rubric leaves it indefinite by whom it is to be said or sung.

XVIII.—PRAYER BEFORE THE PRAYER OF CONSECRATION, AND THE PRAYER OF CONSECRATION.

1. The former was composed for the order of Communion in 1548.

2. The prayer of Consecration in the First Book was a continuation of the prayer for Christ's Church. At the words "vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts," etc., the priest was to make the sign of the Cross over the elements. In that First Book the first of the two clauses which are now used in the distribution stood alone, but in the Second Book (A. D. 1552) both of the first clauses, viz., "the body of our Lord," etc., and "the blood of our Lord," etc., were omitted, and those which are now the second were adopted. These were united in the revision of Elizabeth. In the Second Book, the direction that the priest should place his hand upon the paten and upon each chalice was omitted. It was omitted also in Elizabeth's Book, and not restored again until the last revision of 1662.

3. The rubric which precedes the prayer of consecration, identical in our Book and in the English, has been the subject of much discussion. It directs, that when the priest "hath *so ordered* the bread and wine, that he may with the more decency break the bread before the people," etc. The evident design of the Rubric is, that the elements shall be so arranged that the breaking of the bread shall be in the sight of the people. It designates the place at which he shall stand to *order the elements*, but not that at which he shall break the bread and fill the chalices and say the prayers. By implication, it directs that he shall so stand when he breaks the bread, etc., that he may be seen by the people. This was to

prevent the adoption of the mode of the Romish and Greek Priests, which was that of standing with their backs to the people during the Consecration. It is proper, therefore, to consecrate at the right side of the table.

In the preceding History (chap. x. § 6) it was shown that the decision of the Privy Council in the cases of Purchas and Mackonochie was to the effect "that the prayer of Consecration is to be used at the *north* side of the table so that the minister looks south, whether a broader or narrower side of the Table be towards the north." In a more recent decision of the same ultimate authority, this decision has been so far modified as to sanction the Eastern position when it does not hinder the accomplishment of the object for which the northern position was prescribed, viz., that the bread may be broken in the sight of the people. It seems to be rather a stretch of judicial interpretation in the case of a law enacted to prevent an almost inevitable result, to decide, that because in the few rare cases that result may be avoided, the law shall not hold. The language of the decision in the case of Ridsdale *versus* Clifton is as follows (Folkstone Ritual Case Official Report, p. 746) :—

"There is therefore, in the opinion of their Lordships, a rule sufficiently intelligible to be derived from the directions which are contained in the Rubric as to the acts which are to be performed. The Minister is to order the elements "standing before the Table;" words which, whether the Table stand Altar-wise along the East wall or in the body of the Church or Chancel, would be fully satisfied by his standing on the north side, and looking towards the south; but which also, in the opinion of their Lordships, as the Tables are now usually and in their judgment lawfully placed, authorize him to do those acts standing on the west side, and looking towards the East. Beyond this and after this there is no specific direction that during the prayer he is to stand on the west side or that he is to stand on the north side. He must in the opinion of their Lordships stand so that he may in good faith enable the communicants present or the bulk of them, being properly placed, to see if they wish it the breaking of the bread and the performance of the other manual acts mentioned. He must not so interpose his body as intentionally to defeat the object of the Rubric and defeat this result. It may be difficult in particular cases to say exactly whether this rule has been complied with; but where there is good faith the difficulty ought not to be a serious one; and it is in the opinion of their Lordships clear, that a protection was in this respect intended to be

thrown around the body of the Communicants, which ought to be secured to them by an observance of the plain intent of the Rubric."

When the same tribunal gives different and contradictory decisions, it may not be presumptuous to inquire whether, although the latter decision must be law, the former ought not to have continued to be so. It has been shown in the historical part of this Book (Chapt. x. Sec. ii. § 5) that the position of the officiating minister from the commencement of the Ante-Communion service is to be at the north side of the Table. He is to stand before it only to order the elements. "Beyond this and after this," their Lordships say, "there is no specific direction that during the prayer, he is to stand on the west side or the north side." But if the permanent position of the minister is the north side of the Table, and he is to stand before it for the one purpose of so ordering the bread that he may with more readiness break it before the people, it would seem to follow, without the necessity of further directions, that *when that was done*, he should return to the place at which all the preceding portions of the service had been performed. Their Lordships add that the Minister "must not so interpose his body as *intentionally* to defeat the objects of the Rubric." But the object of the Rubric was that the people should *see*—and that as many of them as the construction of the Church would allow should see—the breaking of the bread. Now it is impossible that as many should see the breaking of the bread when the minister does it standing before the Table as would see it if it were done by him standing at the north side. Unless he be diaphanous his position will certainly prevent *some* of the people from seeing him break the bread; and if he be portly and his surplice large, it is inevitable that many of the people will lose what the Rubric intended they should all enjoy, whether he intentionally or unintentionally deprived them of the privilege.

4. The consecration is not the work of the Priest alone, but of the whole congregation, Priest and people; nor does it take place at, and by virtue of, the mere repetition of our Saviour's words, but is made by the prayer of all, in which those words are included. We have no direct prayer for consecration as have the Greek and Latin Churches.

The Scotch Liturgy and ours retain the Oblation and Invocation of the First Book of Edward, which was subsequently, and is still, omitted in the English Book. But our Book has

some modifications of the language both of the Scotch and the original English office. Its language is carefully guarded to avoid all notions of a change in the elements, whereby they may be supposed to become, in any other than a symbolical sense, the body and blood of Christ. The old Uses from which it was taken did imply such a sense. The Scotch Liturgy is still susceptible of that signification. Its language is, "Vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify, etc., that they *may be unto us* the body and blood of Christ." Our prayer is, "Grant that we, receiving these *thy creatures of bread and wine*, may be partakers of His most blessed body and blood." The modern Scotch office for the Communion is rendered even more favorable to the doctrine of the transmutation of the elements, and of a sacrifice, than the original Scotch Liturgy. It has changed the words "that they (the elements) *may be to us* the body and blood," into the words "that *they may become* the body and blood." "The omission of the words *to us* evidently leaves complete room to infer that there takes place an objective change of the bread and wine, independently of their being used; in short, as existing in themselves with something else which, if not real flesh and blood, is left undefined, and therefore in such language as to allow the whole doctrine of transubstantiation being most easily grafted on the words *may become the body and blood*, both in the literal meaning and in the spirit of that Popish doctrine." (Comparison between the Communion Office of the Church of England and the Scottish Episcopal Church, pp. 12–21.)

5. The Oblation and Invocation, omitted in the English Book, are sometimes objected to, as containing the germs, if not the developed fruit, of Romish error. But there is no sanction of the Romish doctrine of the repetition and presentation of the sacrifice of Christ. The Oblation is that of the alms, and of the elements, called, after consecration, bread and wine; and the Invocation contains a prayer for spiritual blessings,

and the presentation of the spiritual sacrifice of consecrated hearts and bodies. A part of our prayer of invocation is used in the English Book *after* the participation.

XIX.—THE TWO RUBRICS BEFORE DISTRIBUTION, AND THE DISTRIBUTION.

The first Rubric directs that a hymn shall be sung. The second directs the officiating priest to partake of both kinds, and then to deliver to the Bishops, priests, and deacons who may be present, and after that to the people.

1. The question has been raised whether the Rubric intends to direct that clergymen *in the congregation* should go up and receive the Communion with the clergymen within the chancel, or go up *with the people*. The Rubric of 1549 and 1552 sanctions the latter interpretation, for it adds the words, "that they (the clergy in the chancel) may be ready to help the chief minister." This expression has been dropped from the Rubric, but nothing countenancing or enjoining another practice has been introduced. (Stephen's Prayer Book, p. 1208.)

2. The custom of putting the bread into the mouth, and of retaining hold of the cup which is placed at the lips of the communicant, has had no sanction in any of the revisions, nor in the practice of the Church. The Rubric of 1552 directs that the minister, after partaking of both kinds, shall deliver the Communion (in both kinds, of course) *into their hands* kneeling, and this Rubric has been ever since retained.

Kneeling at the Sacrament.—Kneeling to receive the Sacrament had been one of the principal scruples felt by the Presbyterians, at the time when the great majority of them were anxious for comprehension in the National Church. Archbishop Tillotson, acting upon his well-known saying, "Charity is above rubrics," and in accordance with the practice of some of the Elizabethan Divines, was wont to authorize by his example a considerable discretion on this point. Bishop Patrick, on the other hand, though no less earnest in his advocacy of comprehen-

sion, did not feel authorized in departing from prescribed order, and when De Moulin desired to receive the Sacrament from him, declined, "not without many kind remarks," to administer to him without his kneeling. After all schemes of comprehension had fallen through, the concession in question became very unfrequent. A pamphleteer of 1709 speaks doubtfully whether it occurred or not. A greater license in regard to posture was one of the suggestions of the "free and candid disquisitions."

The form in which the officiating Priest shall himself receive is not prescribed. He may receive in silence or repeat the words.

3. The posture of kneeling ("all devoutly kneeling") is prescribed, but with an explanation, which the framers of our Liturgy did not think it necessary to retain, at the close of the service, that no adoration of the Elements is thereby intended, but only a signification of grateful acknowledgment of Christ's blessing to the faithful recipient of the Communion.

4. Should all the words be pronounced severally to each communicant? The English Rubric is capable of that interpretation, and is generally so understood. Its language is, "When he delivereth the bread to *any one* he shall say," etc. The XXIst Canon of 1604 is more explicit to the same effect. Many Injunctions in the reigns of James I. and Charles I. are to the effect that the Minister shall repeat to each of the communicants all the words. Our Rubric has changed the expression thus, "And *when* he delivereth the bread he shall say," etc. This language was probably intended to be conformed to the different customs which prevailed, and to allow the repetition of all the words to each communicant, or the distribution to several during the repetition.

XX.—THE RUBRICS WHICH FOLLOW THE DISTRIBUTION.

1. The Rubric for a Second Consecration was added in 1662. It seems to have been made necessary by the omission of those intending to communicate to signify their intention. Hence the Priest could not always judge how much bread or wine might be required. In case of a deficiency he is required to repeat only so much of the service as may be necessary in order to consecrate either more bread or wine, as the one or other may be needed.

Our Rubric directs that the Second Consecration should begin with the words, "All glory be to thee," etc., and end with the words, "partakers of His most blessed body and blood." The English Rubric directs that it shall begin with the words, "Our Saviour Christ in the same night," etc. From this it has been argued that the consecration *is* made by the mere recitation of the words of the Saviour—contrary to the statement made above (§ XVIII.). But to this it is answered that all the other portion of the Service having been once said, it is not necessary that it should be repeated. Whether or no this be a sufficient answer as to the English mode, the objection does not lie against our arrangement, because, in our Second Consecration the whole prayer of the Consecration and the Oblation is repeated.

2. The second Rubric directs that what remains of the consecrated Elements shall be covered with a fair linen cloth. The next Rubric directs the Priest to say the Lord's Prayer, "the people repeating after him every petition."

XXI.—THE POST-COMMUNION.

This consists of the Lord's Prayer, the Thanksgiving, the Gloria in Excelsis, and the Benediction—the latter to be pronounced by the Bishop if he be present. The English Book

has two forms of Thanksgiving, either of which may be used. The first form is the conclusion of our prayer of Consecration. The second is the one which we have adopted.

XXII.—THE LAST FIVE COLLECTS.

The addition of the last five Collects is in accordance with the usages of the old Communion Offices. The Rubric declares that they may be said, after the Collects of Morning or Evening Prayer or Communion at the discretion of the Minister. They are seldom used in our Church, except after sermon and upon special occasions.

XXIII.—FREQUENCY OF COMMUNION.

We have no law in our Church prescribing how frequently the Communion may or must be celebrated. The first Rubric in the English Book following the Communion Office, commences thus: "Upon the Sundays and other Holy Days (*if there be no Communion*) shall be said all that is appointed at the Communion to the end of the General Prayer," etc. The expression "if there be no Communion" implies of course that sometimes there is none on Sundays and Holy Days. That this was not an unintended or unlawful omission appears from the fact that a subsequent Rubric (the fourth) requires that in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, and in Colleges, where there are many priests and deacons, they shall all receive the Communion with the Priest every Sunday at the least. The same injunction would no doubt have been made in regard to Parish Churches if the practice had been regarded as obligatory. Many English Liturgical writers however contend that the English Church *requires* the celebration on every Sunday and Holy Day, in case there be a sufficient number to communicate. They declare that there

can legally be no omission of the Communion, except when less than three or four are present to communicate with the Priest—according to the provisions of the second and third Rubric, that there shall be no less than that number. Hence they say that the Ante-Communion Service is read to remind those present of the duty of communicating. But the action of the Church does not correspond with this representation of its design. The Communion is not administered on every Sunday or Holy Day when four or more are present, but is usually in Parish Churches celebrated but once a month. In Cathedrals the Communion may be celebrated by the priests and deacons, without any lay communicants. Neither our own law nor custom, nor that of the Mother Church, implies therefore the duty of the Weekly celebration of the Communion.

XXIV.—THE RUBRICS OF THE ENGLISH BOOK OMITTED IN OUR LITURGY.

There are eight more Rubrics at the end of the English Communion Office than we have. Two refer to the number which must be present—not less than three—in order that the Communion may be celebrated. One directs that in Cathedrals, Collegiate Churches, and Colleges, the clergy shall receive every Sunday. A fourth provides that pure wheat bread shall be used. A fifth which directs, like our own, that the consecrated bread and wine shall be consumed, has also a clause to the effect that the bread and wine which remain unconsecrated shall be taken by the curate for his own use. The sixth declares that the bread and wine shall be provided by the curate and Church wardens at the expense of the parish. The seventh declares that every parishioner shall communicate three times a year, of which Easter shall be one; and that all Ecclesiastical dues shall be paid on that

day. The eighth provides that the Communion Offertory shall be applied to such pious and charitable uses as the Church wardens shall see fit; and if they disagree, the Bishop shall decide. The Scotch Liturgy provides that half of the Offertory shall go to the priest, "to provide him books of holy divinity."

These Rubrics are followed by a declaration that, by the reception of the Sacrament kneeling, no adoration is intended to the Elements, as if Christ's body was present in them; and adds that his body is in heaven, and that it cannot be at one time in more places than one. This declaration was introduced in 1552, and omitted in 1560, and again admitted in 1662. But its first introduction was by Royal proclamation after the Prayer Book had been printed and sanctioned by Parliament, and hence had not full legal sanction. This is the reason for its omission in 1560. It was, however, reintroduced with full authority in 1662. It was omitted as unnecessary in our Book.

XXV.—THE LAST RUBRIC.

The first part of this Rubric has given rise to much discussion. It is as follows: "Upon Sundays and other Holy Days (if there be no sermon or Communion) shall be said all that is appointed at the Communion, unto the end of the Gospel, concluding with the blessing.

In the English Book the words in the parenthesis are, "if there be no Communion." In the review of our Book in 1789 it was put in its present form, "if there be no *sermon* or Communion." Hence it has been interpreted to mean that if there be a sermon the Ante-Communion Service is to be omitted. Because of this interpretation, and the practice under it in some parts of the Church, the House of Bishops made a communication to the Lower House in 1821, in which

they state their reasons against this construction. The following is a summary of the principal part of them.

1. The construction is merely inferential. Had the exception contended for been intended, there is every reason to suppose—because it was new—that it would have been distinctly expressed. The Rubric, moreover, which follows the Ante-Communion Service says, "then shall follow the sermon, *after* which the Minister, when there is a Communion, shall *return* to the Lord's Table." This implies that, previous to the sermon, he had been at the Lord's Table and read the Ante-Communion.

2. The argument, proving too much, proves nothing. On the principle that it should be omitted when there is a sermon, it should be omitted also when there is a Communion. This would leave the Ante-Communion Service, Collects, Epistles, and Gospels almost a dead letter—never to be used except on the very few occasions when there is neither sermon nor Communion.

3. The Rubric *after* the Ante-Communion directs that notices of Holy Days, etc., shall *then* be given. The interpretation contended against would indirectly do away with these notices, or remand them to another part of the service not designated.

4. This interpretation would dispense with the Epistles and Gospels on the highest fasts and festivals—Easter, Whitsunday, Good Friday, etc.—which would take away from them all that is distinctive. It cannot be supposed that this was contemplated as possible by the framers of the service.

5. This argument receives complete confirmation from the fact that the surviving members of the body which framed the services in 1789—Bishop White and others—testified that they did not intend, nor conceive the possibility of such an interpretation.

6. The Ante-Communion Service continued to be used, as

before, by the clergy who were present at and contemporaneous with the Convention of 1789.

The question then occurs, Why were these words, "or sermon," introduced? It was to reconcile the other Rubric, viz., "Then shall follow the sermon," with the frequent practice of omitting the sermon on some saints' days. The parenthesis means, therefore, that *although* there be no sermon, or *although* there be no Communion, the Minister shall act as directed by the present Rubric.

This argument of the Bishops seems conclusive as to the meaning of the Rubric; but it proves, at the same time, that it is unskilfully expressed.

Ceremonies in the celebration of the Eucharist in the Cathedral of Durham, and other Cathedrals and Churches.—A very elaborate ceremonialism prevailed in the Cathedral of Durham during the Episcopate of Bishop Cosin. One of his Canons by the name of Smart published violent attacks upon the Bishop for the introduction of these new customs, and was rewarded for his pains with degredation and imprisonment. The facts, however, which he stated, I do not find to have been called in question; and his punishment was based upon his disobedience and abuse of his Bishop. Some of those practices are quite equal to anything that is seen in Ritualistic Churches in our day. The following are some of them:—

Of bowing to the Altar, Smart thus speaks in his sermon, for which he was condemned, entitled, "The vanity and downfall of superstitious ceremonies:" "I have seen, I have seen, I say, the priest (so he will needs be called) take up the body and blood after consecration, and, holding them up in his hands, make a low leg to the Altar, and before he setteth them down again, bows himself devoutly and worships the Altar. What is this but to prefer a stone or piece of wood before the body of Christ, if this be not, to bow to his Altar and not to his body, to make many legs to the king's chair and none to the king himself."

Again. "A decent cope is commanded by our Canons to be used sometimes, only at the Communion. Whether a stately cope, a sumptuous cope, a cope embroidered with idols of gold and silver and pearl; a mock cope, a scornful (!) cope, used a long time for Mass and May

games as some of ours were; whether, I say, such a cope be a decent cope, fit for the Lord's Table, judge ye, Beloved."

Before SMART was tried and condemned, he put forth a publication with the title, "A short treatise of Altar, Altar furniture, Altar cringing, etc. etc., by Prebendaries and Petty Canons, in glorious copes embroidered with images." In it he makes the following statements: "Thus and then and there began the setting up of Altars and images with a multitude of superstitious ceremonies, changing of services, and corruptions of Sacraments, which, beginning in Durham, have since that time spread themselves over all Cathedral and Collegiate Churches and Colleges in this realm; yea, and many Parish Churches have set up Altars, images, and organs where they were never known before since the reign of KING PHILIP and QUEEN MARY; of all such alterations and Popish innovations in our Church, Bishop NEALE laid the foundation."

In this treatise also, he gives amongst others certain practices ordinarily followed with regard to reverence due to the Altar.

"To teach the choristers going up to the Altar *to make legs* to God when they light the tapers, and when they have done it to go *backward* with their faces to the east and looking on the Altar make legs again to God. At every approaching near it and every departing from it, at the taking up or setting down of anything upon the Altar, ever and anon to make a low courtesy; to make a profound leg to God, especially going out of Church, as if it were taking leave and departing from God, which is a phrase of speech as absurd as the action is vain, superstitious, and idolatrous." (Introduction to the revision of Book of Common Prayer, pp. 329, 339, 340.)

In a note, copied from Bishop Andrews' notes, the following direction that the priests should stand at each end of the Altar, together with the singular explanation of the reason for it, is given:—

"*The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.* Here the Minister riseth, and, if there be a sermon, an introit is sung. After the sermon they ascend with *three adorations* towards the Altar. If both [ministers or] priests, the one at the one end, the other at the other, representing the *two cherubims* (!) at the mercy seat. If one be a deacon, he kneels at the door." (Introduction, etc., p. 356.)

Prynne, in Canterbury's Doom (1446), thus describes the chapel of Peter House, Cambridge, to which COSIN was elected in 1635: "In Peter House Chapel there was a glorious new Altar set up and mounted upon steps, to which the Master, Fellows, and scholars bowed, and were enjoined to bow by Dr. COSINS, the Master who set it up; that there

were basins, candlesticks, tapers standing on it and a great crucifix hanging over it; there was likewise a carved Cross at the end of every seat, and on the Altar a pot, which was usually called the *incense pot*." (Introduction, etc., 363.)

A committee of the House of Lords (1640–4) to consider innovations in doctrine and ritual enumerate the following among Ritual Innovations:—

The turning of the Holy Table Altar-wise, bowing to the east, candlesticks upon the Altar, canopies over the Altar, crucifixes and images on the Altar cloth, etc. (Introduction, p. 380.)

All the facts here mentioned are admitted by Parker, author of the elaborate work, "Introduction to the revisions of the Book of Common Prayer," and adduced as evidence of the revival of Catholic doctrine and Ritual, and as evidence of its rapid extension in the Churches.

CHAPTER V.

BAPTISM OF INFANTS AND ADULTS, AND PRIVATE BAPTISM.

The Ministration of Public Baptism of Infants to be used in the Church.

I.—TITLE AND SOURCES OF THE SERVICE.

The words "for infants" was added to the title of this service in 1662. In its preparation much use was made of the previous labors of Bucer, and Melancthon, and the Consultation of Herman.

II.—TO BE PERFORMED IN CHURCH.

A Rubric in the office for private Baptism declares, that except there be great and reasonable cause, Baptism shall not be performed in houses. The Rubric of the First Book

of Edward, which we have abbreviated and modified, declares that it is most convenient that Baptism should be administered upon Sundays and Holy Days, when the most number of people come together, and this for the reason that the congregation may testify that they receive the newly Baptized into the Church, and are themselves reminded of their baptismal obligations.

III.—THE FIRST RUBRIC.

Our Rubric, abbreviated from the present English Rubric (which was itself an abbreviation of that in the First Book of Edward), declares that it is most convenient that Baptism should be administered upon Sundays and Holy Days, or Prayer Days, but that, if necessity require, it may be administered upon any other day. The expression "Prayer Days" as distinguished from Holy Days appears to refer to Wednesdays and Fridays, and to recognize them as such.

The first Rubric required the sponsors to be ready with the child at the *door*, the second Rubric, at the *font*. The latter direction is still retained. "Fonts were set at first some distance from the Church, after in the Church Porch, and that significantly, because Baptism is the entrance into the Church mystical, as the porch to the temple. At last, they got into the Church, but not into every, but the city Church, where the Bishop resided, hence called the Mother Church, because it gave spiritual birth by baptism; afterwards they were brought into rural Churches." (Bishop Sparrow, Rationale, p. 112.)

IV.—THE SECOND AND THIRD RUBRICS.

The English Rubric and ours provide that for every male child there shall be two Godfathers and one Godmother; and for every female child, two Godmothers and one God-

father. Our Rubric adds that parents may be admitted as sponsors. This was added because of the difficulty in a new country of always securing the requisite number of sponsors, and because of the propriety of the arrangement in itself when it was desired.

"In the primitive Church, they (Godfathers and Godmothers) were so early, that it is not easy to fix the time of their beginning. Some of the most ancient fathers make mention of them, and through all the successive ages afterwards we find the use of them continued without any scruple or interruption, till the Anabaptists and other Puritans of late years raised some idle clamors against them."

"How long the Church has fixed the number of these sureties I cannot tell, but by a constitution of Edmund, Archbishop of Canterbury, in the year 1236, and in a synod held at Worcester 1240, I find the same provision made as now required by our Rubric." (Wheatley.)

The third Rubric directs, that when children are to be baptized, notice must be given before Morning Prayer, and that the service is to be performed after the Second Lesson at Morning or Evening Prayer. The English Book requires that notice shall be given over night, or before Morning Prayer.

Bishop White, in his Memoirs of the Church, deprecates what he conceives to be an increasing tendency in some of the clergy to administer Episcopal Baptism to such as desire it, on the alleged doubts of the validity of the former Baptism. This he believes to be contrary to the Rubrics, and demonstrated to be so by many judicious divines of the Church of England. The question of the validity of Baptism by persons not Episcopally ordained, was first started in England, during the latter part of the reign of Queen Anne, and was connected with political manœuvres in favor of the Pretender. It was then customary to stigmatize the Hanoverian family

as unbaptized Lutherans. Archdeacon Sharp refers to this question in one of his charges. "In that year" (1712), says he, "the dispute about the invalidity of lay Baptism running pretty high, the two Archbishops, with all the Bishops of their provinces that were in town, came unanimously to this resolution—that lay Baptism should be discouraged as much as possible, but if the essentials had been preserved in a Baptism by a lay hand it was not to be repeated." (Bishop Brownell's Commentary on Pr. Bk., p. 403.)

V.—THE EXHORTATION AND THE TWO PRAYERS.

The Exhortation remains the same as it was in 1549, and is similar to the Exhortation in Herman's Consultation.

The first prayer is substantially the same as in 1552. It differs from that of 1549, principally by the omission of the following petition: "that by this wholesome laver of regeneration, whatsoever sin is in them may be clean washed away." The prayer is taken from the Consultation of Herman, and was composed by Luther. It was followed in the First Book by the ceremony of making the cross upon the child's forehead and breast, with the words which are now used when the Baptism is administered. The next prayer is a translation of one in the Sarum Office for making a catechumen. There is a very similar prayer in Herman's Consultation.

The second prayer was followed, in the Book of 1549, by an adjuration or exorcism, in which the Devil was commanded to leave the child and enter into him no more.

VI.—THE GOSPEL, EXHORTATION, PRAYER FOLLOWING, AND THE EXHORTATION TO SPONSORS.

The Rubric permits all the following portions of the Service to the questions to be omitted, in case the intermediate

part shall have been used in the Church within a month. There is no such permission in the English Book.

The direction in the English Book, in the Rubric before the Gospel, which requires the people to stand up, was inserted in 1662. It was omitted, we think unadvisedly, in our Book. Inasmuch as the reading of the Gospels is not always heard by the people standing—*e. g.*, in the second lessons—it might appear doubtful whether standing was the attitude to be assumed in this place. But the general and evidently proper custom of our congregations is to stand.

The Gospel is the same as in 1549, and in Herman's Book. The Exhortation was also taken from the same office. It was changed in 1552 to its present form from that of 1549, in the conclusion of the latter, which ended with the Lord's Prayer and the Creed. The prayer which followed is also from the same source.

At this point, in 1549, was concluded the Introductory Office, all of which was performed at the church door. Then the child was introduced into the Church, with the words, "The Lord vouchsafe to receive you into His Holy Household, and to keep and govern you always in the same, that you may have everlasting life." The Exhortation also is from the same source, and is substantially the same as in 1549.

VII.—THE QUESTIONS, THE FOUR PETITIONS, THE PRAYER, AND THE ADMINISTRATION.

In the Rubric of 1549, the Priest was to demand of *the child* these questions, and the demands were put *separately* to each child. This was changed, in 1552 to the present form of putting the questions to the *sponsors*, which was the mode prescribed in Herman's Book. The clause, "in the name of this child," however, was not added until 1662. Our Rubric,

instead of directing that the questions shall be put *separately*, declares that they shall "be *considered* as addressed to them *severally*."

In the English Book, the question is, "Dost thou believe in God the Father, etc.?"—the whole Creed being then repeated. Our question is, "Dost thou believe all the articles of the Christain faith as contained in the Apostles' Creed?"

The English Rubric directs that the child shall be dipped in the font discreetly and warily, but another Rubric adds, that if the child be weak, it may suffice to pour water upon it. Our Rubric permits either custom. The First Book directed that there should be a trine immersion. This was omitted in all the subsequent revisions. One Rubric in our Book directs that the sign of the cross shall be made upon the child's forehead, but a Rubric which follows permits its omission in case those who present the child desire it. This permission is not given in the English Church. In the First Book there was also performed the ceremony of *Chrism*, the anointing of the child's forehead with oil, and the putting on the *Chrisom* or white robe, emblematic of "the innocency which, by God's grace in the Holy Sacrament of Baptism," was described as given to the child.

The four petitions for the child, and the prayer for the sanctification of the water, were originally placed at the end of the Office for Private Baptism, as a service to be used for the consecration of the water when it had been changed. This was to be at least every month (Proctor, p. 369. Blakeney, p. 508). It was not until 1662 that the direction was given that the font should be filled at each time that Baptism was administered.

VIII.—THE CHANGES INTRODUCED INTO THIS OFFICE.

The changes introduced into this Office are significant of the design of the Reformers and the revisers of the service

to purge it from all superstitious ceremonial and all false doctrine. In accordance with the first object was the omission of the Exorcism, the trine immersion, the Chrism, and the Chrisom. The second object was accomplished by the omission of the words, "laver of regeneration" (Titus, ii. 5), as applicable to the *Sacrament* of Baptism; and by the substitution of the words, "mystical washing away of sin," in 1662, for the words, "sanctify this fountain of Baptism, that by the power of thy Word all those that shall be baptized therein may be spiritually regenerated."

Ministration of Private Baptism in Houses.

I.—THE FIRST THREE RUBRICS.

These are the same in the English Book and in ours, and substantially the same as in the First Book of Edward. The first declares the duty of the Minister to admonish the people not to defer Baptism beyond the first or second Sunday after the birth of the child. The second declares that not without great cause or necessity should children be baptized at home. The third directs him to say the Lord's Prayer and as many Collects before the form of Public Baptism as the exigency will permit, and then to baptize the child with only the words, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen."

II.—LAY BAPTISM.

The First Book of Edward permitted a layman to baptize a child. The language of the Rubric was, "And then one of them" (*i. e.*, one of those present) "shall name the child and dip him in the water," etc.

An attempt was made, unsuccessfully, in 1575 to set aside

this permission. This was by a Canon of Convocation which professed to explain the Rubric as of doubtful construction, and limited the Baptism to a lawful minister. But the Queen would not sanction the change, and it was not effected until 1604. King James was averse to the practice of lay Baptism, and accordingly the Rubric in 1604 was changed, and the words "lawful minister" introduced. In 1662 it was again changed, and then read, "the Minister of the parish, or any other lawful Minister that can be procured."

Proctor observes that from this time lay Baptism has been disallowed in the Church of England (p. 379). It is true that its performance has been *disallowed*, or rather discouraged, but it has been repeatedly decided in the English Ecclesiastical Courts that Baptism, when regular in form, either by layman or heretic, is valid in the Church of England. (Stephen's Prayer Book, pp. 1289–96.)

III.—CERTIFICATION OF THE BAPTISM IN CHURCH.

1. If the child was baptized by the Minister of the parish, *he* shall certify to that effect. (5th Rubric.)

2. If he was baptized by any other lawful Minister, then inquiry shall be made if everything was done, "as it ought to be," and then the Minister, if satisfied as to this point, shall certify that the child was lawfully baptized. (6th Rubric.)

3. What the right performance consists in may be learned from the questions in the English Book, and from the last Rubric but one in the service. From these we learn that the *essential parts* of Baptism are—Baptism with water in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. But we learn, also, that in the English service everything cannot be regarded as having been done "as it should be" unless the child were baptized by a lawful minister.

4. When, in the English Church, the right form has been used, but not by the lawful Minister, in the sense of the Rubric—that is, when done by a layman or woman—either of two courses may be adopted. It may be passed by, and the person may, in Confirmation, testify his ratification of the act, or he may be hypothetically baptized. (Proctor, p. 382.)

5. By the omission in our Book of the question, "By whom was this child baptized?" and by the retention of the Rubric which declares that the essential parts of Baptism are water and Baptism in the name of the three persons of the Trinity, our Church seems to have left the decision of the question who is a lawful minister, in the meaning of the third Rubric, to the officiating Minister. But in case it cannot appear that the child was baptized with "the essential parts of Baptism," then the Minister shall say, in performing the service, "If thou art not already baptized, I Baptize thee," etc.

6. Our service adds a Rubric, not found in the English Book, which provides for the case in which the Baptism of infants and the reception of infants baptized in private takes place at the same time. In that case the questions to the sponsors and the succeeding prayers may serve for both. And after the Baptism and the receiving into the Church, the minister may use the remainder of the service for both.

IV.—THE SERVICE COMPARED WITH THAT FOR PUBLIC BAPTISM.

The service is the same as that for public Baptism, except that the language is conformed to the fact that the child *has been*, instead of being about to be, baptized.

Baptism of Those of Riper Years.

I.—ORIGIN OF THE OFFICE.

This office was added at the last review in 1662, and was composed by Dr. George Griffith, Bishop of St. Asaph. It became necessary in consequence of the growth of Anti-Pædobaptist principles, and the general neglect of ordinances during the Rebellion.

II.—BY WHOM ADMINISTERED.

Mr. Stephens (Book of Common Prayer, p. 1423) remarks that "throughout this office the officiating person is styled 'priest,' and that as deacons receive authority to baptize only infants, and even those only in 'the absence of the priest,' it is clear that they have no authority to administer adult Baptism." In our service the word "Minister" is substituted for "priest," and the administration of adult Baptism by deacons, though sometimes practised, is not sanctioned, but is by implication forbidden, in the Ordination service.

III.—THE THREE INTRODUCTORY RUBRICS.

1. The first Rubric in the English Book requires notice of a week at least by the parents of the candidate, or some other discreet persons, to the Bishop, or whom he shall appoint for that purpose. Our Rubric has somewhat modified these directions. It requires *timely* notice to the Minister, and does not specify by whom it shall be given. The object of the timely notice is that the candidate may be sufficiently instructed in the principles of the Christian religion,

and may prepare himself, by prayer and fasting, for the right reception of the Holy Sacrament.

2. The next Rubric directs that the Godfathers and Godmothers shall be ready to present the candidates at the font immediately after the second lesson at Morning or Evening Prayer. The Godfathers and Godmothers appear as witnesses, and only undertake to remind those who are baptized of the vows made in their presence. The number of these witnesses is not specified, but it may be assumed that it was intended to be the same as that of sponsors in infant Baptism. There is no authority in the Baptismal Offices for the representation of Godfathers and Godmothers by proxy, although, on general principles, the practice may not be considered censurable.

3. The third Rubric directs that the question shall be asked whether the person presented has been baptized, and, if a negative answer shall be given, the service shall then proceed.

IV.—VARIATIONS OF THE SERVICE FROM THAT FOR INFANT BAPTISM.

The service is formed upon that for the Baptism of infants, with the changes which adapt it to the different circumstances of the persons who are to be baptized. The Gospel is taken from our Saviour's discourse with Nicodemus concerning the necessity of a new birth of water and the Spirit, and the Exhortation which follows it treats of repentance in connection with Baptism. And, since the candidates are able to make, in their own persons, their professions of faith and obedience, the demands are addressed to them. The concluding Exhortations warn the baptized to walk answerably to their Christian calling, and admonish the witnesses of their duty to remind those whose vows they have heard of the solemn obligations which they have assumed.

V.—CHANGES FROM THE ENGLISH OFFICE.

Our office has, in some slight particulars, varied from that of the English Book. In the Rubric before the Gospel, the direction to the people to stand up is omitted. The questions in the English Book are addressed *severally* to each of the candidates. Our Rubric states that the questions are to be "*considered* as addressed to them *severally*, and the answers to be made accordingly." The Creed is repeated in the English Book, and in ours the question is asked, "Dost thou believe all the articles of the Christian faith *contained in* the Apostles' Creed?"

VI.—THE CONCLUDING RUBRICS.

1. In both English and American offices the first of the concluding Rubrics declares it to be expedient that every person thus baptized should be confirmed by the Bishop so soon after his baptism as conveniently may be, that so he may be admitted to the Holy Communion.

2. A second Rubric in the English Book provides that, "if any persons not baptized in infancy shall be brought to be baptized before they be come to years of discretion to answer for themselves, it may suffice to use the office for the public Baptism of infants, or (in case of extreme danger) the office for private Baptism; only changing the word *infant* for child or person, as occasion requireth." This Rubric is the fourth in our Book.

3. Our Book has two additional Rubrics, not found in the English office. The first permits private Baptism in houses in cases of extreme sickness, and requires a convenient number of persons to be present. In the exhortation it substitutes the word "desirous" for the words "come hither

desiring." The second provides for the case of infant and adult Baptism to be performed at the same time, and prescribes the order of the services thus combined.

CHAPTER VI.

THE CATECHISM, CONFIRMATION, AND MATRIMONY.

The Catechism.

I.—ITS ORIGIN.

The Catechism was inserted in the First Book of Edward, and in the Books of Edward and Elizabeth formed part of the order for Confirmation. An exposition of the elements of Christian faith and practice was peculiar to the Reformation. The Injunctions of 1536 and 1538 ordered the curates to teach the people the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments, sentence by sentence, on Sundays and Holy Days. On the accession of Edward these Injunctions were repeated, and as soon as the Prayer Book was prepared the Catechism was placed in it. The explanation of the Sacrament was added in 1604, and is generally attributed to Bishop Overall, then Dean of St. Pauls. It was added by Royal authority, "by way of explanation," these words being used in order to bring them under the clause of Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, which empowered the Sovereign, with the advice of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, to ordain other ceremonies, and explain those already established, if they were misused or misapprehended. (Cardwell, Conferences, p. 227.) They received, however, the virtual sanction

of Convocation, in the order given by that body that the amended Book should be provided for the use of Parish Churches.

One alteration, significant of the desire of those who revised our service to avoid a seeming sanction to the doctrine of the actual reception of the real body and blood of Christ, was made in the definition of the inward part or thing signified in the Lord's Supper. Instead of the words, "The body and the blood of Christ which are *verily* and *indeed* taken and received," we have, in our Book, the word *spiritually* taken and received.

II.—POYNET'S AND NOWELL'S CATECHISM.

It was the design of the Reformers that another authorized Catechism should be framed for the instruction of more advanced students, and especially those in public schools. This work was assigned to Poynet, Bishop of Winchester, and was published in Latin and English in 1553. It had been approved by Cranmer, and sanctioned by Convocation. It seems, however, never to have come into general, much less exclusive, use. Hence it was agreed by the Bishops, in 1561, that another and longer Catechism should be prepared for communicants, and still another, in Latin, for the schools. They were composed by Dean Nowell, who took Poynet's as his groundwork, and were presented to the Convocation Nov. 11, 1562 (Proctor, p. 392). Although the work was approved and amended, it was not formally sanctioned, "apparently because it was treated as a larger design which was not realized." This Catechism was decidedly Calvinistic in its doctrinal teaching.

III.—WHEN AND WHERE TO BE TAUGHT.

The Rubrics at the close of the Catechism direct the Minister of every parish, upon Sundays and Holy Days, or other convenient seasons, openly in the Church to instruct such children as shall be presented to him in such parts of the Catechism as he shall judge convenient; and also enjoin upon fathers, mothers, masters, and mistresses to cause their children, servants, and apprentices to attend the Church for this purpose.

Order of Confirmation.

I.—MEANING AND AUTHORITY OF THE RITE.

Confirmation is administered to those who were baptized in infancy, and is required of those who come to the Lord's Supper. It is regarded by our Church as a rite instituted by the Apostles, and intended to be permanent (Acts viii. 16, 17, xix.; Heb. vi. 1), and as furnishing a divinely ordained means of making a public profession of faith, which is required of those who are enrolled as the disciples of Christ.

II.—ORIGIN AND TITLE OF THE SERVICE.

In the first Prayer Book of 1549 the title of this service was, "Confirmation, wherein is contained a Catechism for Children." Bucer took exception at the review to the word *children*, and in the Second Book the title was simply "Confirmation." At the Conference of Hampton Court the ministers then objected that the word Confirmation seemed to imply that Baptism was invalid without it, and that it supplied the defectiveness of Baptism. The title was, therefore, changed to this form: "The order of Confirmation, or

laying on of hands upon Children baptized, and able to render an account of their faith, according to the Catechism following." In the last review of 1662 it was changed to its present form.

III.—AGE AND QUALIFICATIONS FOR CONFIRMATION.

The Rubrics which are at the end of the Catechism direct that *children* (together with servants and apprentices) when they have reached a *competent* age and can *say* the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and answer to the questions of the Catechism, shall be brought to the Bishop to be confirmed by him. From these Rubrics the inference has been drawn, or the charge made, that children of any age, and with no other qualification than that of being able to repeat the Catechism, may be Confirmed.

1. The only restriction as to age which is expressed in the present Rubric is that the person to be confirmed shall have come *to years of discretion*. As in the Church of England important civil and personal interests have depended upon the privilege of partaking of the Communion—which must be preceded by Confirmation—it has been necessary to have it *legally* decided what is the precise signification of the phrase, "years of discretion." The law of England determines that persons shall be presumed to have reached that period when they are fourteen years of age. In our Church there is no definition, by Rubric or Canon, as to what may be regarded as years of discretion. The decision of this point is left to the judgment of the Rector.

2. Nor can it be truly said that in the Church of England, or in our Church, no other qualification for Confirmation is required than the ability merely to *say* the Catechism. For after the Rubric which provides that he shall learn the Catechism, there follows a Rubric which provides that the curate shall present in writing to the Bishop the names of

such persons as he thinks *fit* to be presented, and if the *Bishop approve* them they are *then* to be confirmed. Moreover, the nature of the office itself makes it evident that spiritual qualifications are required—the same that are required in adult Baptism—and that the renewal of the baptismal vow covers the whole ground of Christian obligation.

IV.—HISTORY OF THE SERVICE.

In 1549 the Bishop was directed, not only to ay his hands upon the candidate, but to sign his forehead with the sign of the cross. This was omitted in 1552, and the present prayer, "Defend, O Lord," etc., was substituted for the prayer of 1549. The service was brought into its present form in 1662. Being separated from the Catechism, its title was "The order of Confirmation and laying on of hands," etc. What had previously been an explanatory Rubric before the Catechism, was changed into a preface to be read at the opening of the Service of Confirmation; and, instead of questions from the Catechism, the solemn demand of personal acknowledgment of the Baptismal vow is addressed to the candidates, to be answered by each one for himself. The English Rubric requires a Godfather or Godmother as a witness of Confirmation. Our Church has not retained this custom, and has dropped the Rubric.

The Form of Solemnization of Matrimony.

I.—SEASONS WHEN MARRIAGE IS TO BE SOLEMNIZED.

During the fourth century, marriage, together with other festivities, was forbidden to be celebrated during Lent, and in the eleventh century, at other seasons also. In England there are no seasons prohibited by law, but general custom

has prescribed that the marriage ceremony shall not be performed during Lent or any occasion of public fast. In the Convocation of 1661, it was proposed that marriages should not be celebrated from Advent Sunday until eight days after the Epiphany, from Septuagesima Sunday until eight days after Easter, from Rogation Sunday until Trinity Sunday. This proposal was not carried into effect. (Cardwell's Synodalia, 1, p. 134.) We have no law upon the subject.

II.—FIRST RUBRIC.

This Rubric directs, that inasmuch as the laws respecting Matrimony are different in the several States, the Minister is left to the direction of those laws in everything that regards the civil contract between the parties.

III.—BANS OF MARRIAGE.

When the civil law of the State requires the publication of the bans in Churches, the Minister is required to proclaim them three times in the form prescribed in the Rubric. The object of this publication is to prevent clandestine and unlawful marriages, by giving publicity to the intention of the parties. This publication is required *in all cases* in the Church of England. The English Rubric designates three several Sundays or Holy Days as those on which the bans shall be published, and specifies the time—immediately before the sentences of the offertory—at which the publication shall be made. But by Acts of Parliament (26 Geo. II. c. 33, and 4 Geo. IV. c. 76), it is directed that the bans of Matrimony shall be published upon three Sundays preceding the solemnization of marriage, immediately after the Second Lesson. This provision was introduced to remedy the Rubric which allowed the publication to be made only in the Morning

Service, when the Ante-Communion Service was read. Our Rubric does not restrict the notices to Sundays or Holy Days, and indicates the point in the service at which the publication shall be made.

"Some clergymen in the Church of England have doubted whether they are bound to publish bans in case they themselves do not fancy or approve of the match; because there is no penalty by the Canons of 1604 provided for those who neglect or refuse to publish the bans, as there is for those who refuse to christen, bury," etc. (Johnson's Vade Mecum, 1, 200.)

IV.—PLACE AND HOUR FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE MARRIAGE.

Our Rubric directs that the persons to be married shall come into the body of the Church, or in some proper house, with their friends and neighbors; and it makes no restriction as to the hour when the service may be performed. The 62d Canon of the English Church requires that the ceremony shall be performed during Divine Service, and between the hours of eight and twelve in the forenoon. The former provision has long ceased to be observed: but the latter is rigidly enforced. The same Canon prohibits Ministers from performing the marriage ceremony at any other hour, upon pain of suspension for three years. The Archbishop of Canterbury alone is authorized to give special license by which parties can be married *quolibet loco aut tempore honesto.* In cases of license by Bishops, only the place and not the hour can be changed. Licenses are contemplated only in the case of those who are "of good state and quality." (Canon CI.) (Johnson's Vade Mecum, 1, 208. Stephen's Pr. Bk., p. 1556.)

The parties are directed to come into the body of the

Church. This was a change from the ancient custom, which was for the parties to pause at the door, where a large part of the ceremony was performed, and the dowry of the wife was conveyed to her.

V.—POSITION OF THE PARTIES.

The man is directed to stand upon the right hand and the woman on the left. The right hand, as the most honorable place, is, by the Greek and Latin and all Christian Churches, assigned to the man, as being the head of the wife. The Jews, on the other hand, placed the woman on the right of the husband, in allusion to the expression in the XLVth Psalm; "At thy right hand did stand the Queen in vesture of gold." (Wheatley on Common Prayer, 401.)

VI.—THE FIRST ADDRESS TO THE CONGREGATION.

The address is much shortened by omissions in our service. The reference to Christ's presence at the marriage of Cana, and to the signification of marriage as symbolical of the mystical union of Christ and his Church, are omitted. The words "unadvisedly or lightly," in the English Service, are followed by the expressions "wantonly to satisfy men's carnal lusts and appetites, like brute beasts that have no understanding." The causes for which matrimony was ordained are also omitted in our Service. They are declared to be for the procreation of children, as a remedy against fornication, and for mutual society, help and comfort.

VII.—THE CHARGE TO THE PARTIES TO BE MARRIED AND THE IMPEDIMENTS TO MARRIAGE.

The charge to the congregation to show just cause, if they are aware of any, why the parties should not be joined

together in matrimony, is followed by another to the parties themselves, which is still more solemn. The impediments specified in the CII. Canon of the English Church are: 1. A preceding marriage or contract, or any controversy or suit depending upon the same; 2. Consanguinity or affinity; and 3. Want of consent of parents or guardians. If any of the impediments above mentioned are alleged, and the person that declares it "will be bound, and sufficient sureties with him" (such is the language of the Rubric which follows), "or else put in a caution (to the full value of such charges as the persons to be married do thereby sustain) to prove his allegation; *then the solemnization must be deferred until such time as the truth be tried.*"

Besides the three impediments mentioned in CII. Canon, there are others which have been specified by English law. They are, minority, incompetency, insanity, and want of consent of one of the parties.

Our Rubric states that, "if the Minister shall have *reason to doubt of* the lawfulness of the proposed marriage, *he may demand sufficient surety for his indemnification*," in case he proceeds with the ceremony. But it does not, like the English Rubric, make it obligatory upon the objecting party or parties to give security to indemnify the persons to be married of "such charges as they shall sustain." Nor does it, like the English Rubric, declare that in case impediments are alleged and sureties given, "the solemnization must be deferred until such time as the truth be tried." It merely provides for a case in which the Minister has a doubt, and contemplates his proceeding with the ceremony, provided he receives sufficient surety for his indemnification. It does not specifically direct him to defer the ceremony if his indemnification be not provided for—although the right to do so seems involved in the permission to proceed in case such indemnification is assured. It would seem, however, upon the

ground of duty to both parties, and to the public, and to the laws of the land, as well as from the analogy with the English Rubric, that in case an impediment be alleged, which would make a marriage illegal, by the laws of the State, if it should be proved, and the party making the objection binds himself to prove it by sufficient evidence or by a legal process, it would not only be the right but the duty of the minister to defer the ceremony until the charge should be disproved. This conclusion seems also confirmed by the closing words of the Rubric; "but if no impediment be alleged or suspected, the Minister shall say to the man," etc. *In that case*, "he shall say," etc. If that is *not* the case, it would seem to be involved in the direction that *then* he should *not say*, but pause at that point and defer the ceremony "until such time as the truth be tried."

The impediments to marriage in the United States are, in general, the same as those in England; but the laws upon the subject are different in different States of the Union.

VIII.—THE QUESTIONS.

"There is no difference in the duties, nor consequently in the terms of the covenant between the man and his wife: except that the woman is obliged to *obey* and *serve* her husband. Nor is this a difference of our own devising, but is expressly ordered by God himself, who, in those places of Scripture where he enjoins husbands to love their wives, commands the wives to be subject and obedient to their husbands. (Eph. v. 22, 24; Col. iii. 18; Titus ii. 5; 1 Pet. iii. 1, 5.) "The rules also of society make it necessary, for equality," says Chrysostom, "breeds contention; and one of the two must be superior, or else both would strive perpetually for dominion." (Wheatley on the Common Prayer, 416.)

In King Edward's Book, and in all the books till the last

review, the words were "till death us *depart;*" that is, divide, separate, or, as it now stands, "do part."

IX.—THE GIVING OF THE WOMAN AND THE MUTUAL TROTH.

The giving of the woman in marriage by the father, or friend, or guardian is very ancient. The phrase of "*giving* a daughter to wife" appears often in the earliest Scripture records (Gen. xxix. 19; Joshua xv. 16); and the custom arises from the fact that daughters and unmarried women have always been under the charge of fathers and guardians, whose consent was necessary to make their acts valid. The question, "Who giveth this woman to be married to this man?" is one "well suited," as Wheatley expresses it, "to the modesty of the sex," as intimating that, while she consents, she has been sought by the man and bestowed by the parent. (Wheatley, p. 412. Stephens, p. 1604.)

It is to be observed that the woman is to be given, not to the man, but to the Minister; for the Rubric adds that "the Minister shall receive her at her father's or friend's hands." This is intended to express the sacredness of the compact, and to intimate that she is given up by her father to God, and that God gives her in marriage, and provides a wife for the man as he did, at first, for Adam.

The Minister then directs the man to take the woman by the right hand. "The joining of hands naturally signifies contracting a friendship and making a covenant; and the right hand especially was esteemed so sacred that Cicero calls it *the witness of our faith.*" (Wheatley, 413.) This taking of the right hand and giving "their troth each to the other" constitutes a mutual stipulation to be faithful to each other in the discharge of all the obligations of the marriage covenant. The former was a declaration made to the Min-

ister of God that they would be thus faithful; this is a declaration made to each other.

The compact is not only very solemn, as it recognizes the religious significance of marriage, but it is also very complete, as it is a human contract of binding legal force. It is a conveyance of each to the other, in strict legal phraseology. It is a deed of conveyance to "have and to hold" until death, notwithstanding any changes which may occur to either party in habits and manners, in wealth or in health.

The York Manual, in use before the Reformation, had an addition to the present words of "*fairer or fouler.*" In the old Salisbury Manual, instead of the promise "to love, cherish, and obey," the woman engaged to be "*bonair and buxom in bedde and at borde.*" In the York Manual, also, instead of promising to "serve and obey," the woman promised to be *buxom* to the husband. But that this word then signified that which was equivalent to "serve and obey" appears from the margin of the Manual, in which it is explained by the words "*meek and obedient.*" Chaucer also sometimes uses the word *buxomness* as synonymous with *lowliness* and *submission.* (Bailey's Dictionary.)

X.—THE RING.

1. *The Rubric.*—This directs, first, that the parties shall loose hands; then gives a general direction that the man shall give unto the woman a ring; then proceeds to specify the mode by which the ring shall be given. The Minister shall take the ring and deliver it unto the man to put it upon the fourth finger of the woman's left hand; and the man, holding the ring, then, and taught by the Minister, shall repeat the pledge which follows. The English Rubric differs somewhat from our own. It directs that he shall give the

woman a ring, "laying the same upon the book with the accustomed duty to the priest and clerk."

2. *Signification of the Ring.*—The contracting parties have given, each to the other, a solemn verbal declaration of fidelity. This is followed by the delivery and acceptance of a visible pledge of their mutual troth. This pledge is a ring, and, by the First Prayer Book of King Edward VI., was to be accompanied "with other tokens of spousage, as gold and silver." This was a custom common to the Jews and to the Romans, and adopted in the early Church. (Stephens, pp. 1608–10.) A ring was probably selected as the pledge because anciently the ring was a seal by which all orders and contracts were signed. (Wheatley, p. 417.) The acceptance of the pledge by the woman is her pledge also that "she makes herself over as his wife." (Wheatley, *Idem.*) The Roman Ritualists have found symbolical meanings in the form of the ring and in the gold of which it is composed, but neither in the Rubrics nor in the service is the ring contemplated in any other relation than that of a *pledge.*

These words were objected to at the Savoy Conference by the Puritan Ministers because, "Seeing this ceremony of the ring in marriage is made necessary to it, and a significant sign of the vow and covenant betwixt the parties, and Roman Ritualists give such reasons for the use and institution of the ring as are either frivolous or superstitious, it is desired that this ceremony of the ring in marriage may be left indifferent to be used or forborne."

To which the Bishops answered: "The ring is a significant sign only of human institution, and was always given as a pledge of fidelity and constant love, and here is no reason why it should be taken away, nor are the reasons mentioned by the Roman Ritualists given in our Common Prayer Book." (Cardwell's Conference, 330, 360.)

3. *The Fee.*—The direction that with the ring there shall

be laid upon the Book "the accustomed duty to the priest and clerk" is omitted in our Book, and no provision is elsewhere made for the payment of a fee to the clergyman. In England marriage fees are recoverable by common law only when there can be proved to have been an immemorial custom of paying them. The attempt to recover them in parishes where the parties are married but not resident, or by a Rector from parties who belong to his parish but are married elsewhere, has not been sanctioned by the courts. (Stephens, pp. 1610–13.) In our country the custom of paying fees is well nigh universal, and is generally large in proportion to the means of the bridegroom.

XI.—THE DECLARATION WITH THE RING.

1. When the man espouses his wife with the ring, he puts it upon the fourth finger of her left hand. The Rubric of the Salisbury Manual says that the reason of this is, because from thence there proceeds a particular vein to the heart. After this fanciful reason was disproved, there was still no reason why the ring should be placed upon another finger.

2. Holding the ring upon this finger and taught by the priest—that is, the priest pronouncing the words before him—he declares "with this ring I thee wed." After these words, in the First Book of Edward VI., followed, "this gold and silver I thee give," at the repeating of which words it was customary to give the woman a purse of money as livery and seisin of his estate.

3. In the English Service, after the words, "I thee wed," follow the words, "with my body I thee worship." English Ritualists show readily enough that the word *worship* is synonymous with honor, and explain the words to mean that the husband will always render to the wife all external courtesy and respect.

4. The words, "With all my worldly goods I thee endow," promise less, in fact, than they seem to imply. "They promise a maintenance suited to the man's quality, or a participation of his fortune and estate. Wherever he is master, she is mistress. The wife is to have all things in common with her husband." The effort to obtain more, on the ground of this promise, than the law allows or provides for the wife, would not be sustained.

5. The words, "in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost," were objected to, in the Savoy Conference, on the ground that, being used in Baptism, they seem to make of Matrimony, equally with Baptism, a Sacrament. But the Bishops justly answered that the same objection would equally make important civil actions—such as wills and endowments—Sacraments, because they, too, are "in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost."

XII.—THE CONCLUDING PORTION OF THE SERVICE.

The next Rubric directs that, the ring being left upon the fourth finger of the woman's left hand, the Minister shall say the Lord's Prayer and the prayer following. A Rubric which follows directs the Minister to join the right hands of the parties and to say, "Those whom God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." Then follows the solemn declaration that the parties are man and wife, and the service is closed with the Benediction.

XIII.—THE CONCLUDING PORTION OF THE ENGLISH SERVICE.

This is the same to this point in both Books, with the exception that before the prayer, "O Eternal God," etc., we have introduced the Lord's Prayer. But after the Benediction there are in the English Book several forms which we

have omitted. The clerks are directed, after the Benediction, to go to the Lord's Table and sing or say the *Beati omnes* (Psalm cxxviii.), or the *Deus misereatur*. Then follow the Versicles, "Lord, have mercy," etc., with the Lord's Prayer, the man and woman kneeling before the Lord's Table. Then again follow several Versicles and another prayer. This is followed by a prayer that the parties "may be fruitful in the procreation of children," which is directed by a Rubric to be omitted when the woman is past childbearing. Still another prayer follows that the parties may be faithful to their vows, and another Benediction is pronounced. After this, if there be no sermon declaring the duties of man and wife, the Minister is directed to read an Exhortation which follows, in which those duties are explained by passages of Scripture, from St. Peter and St. Paul. The concluding Rubric declares that it is convenient that the newly married persons should receive the Holy Communion at the time of their marriage, or at the first opportunity after their marriage.

CHAPTER VII.

THE ORDER FOR THE VISITATION AND COMMUNION OF THE SICK.

The Order for the Visitation of the Sick.

I.—SOURCES OF THIS SERVICE.

"This service, like that of private Baptism, is intended to bring the ministration of the Church to the chambers of those who are unable to join in her public worship." The present

order for the Visitation of the Sick is taken mainly from the Use of Sarum. The salutation "Peace be to this house" was formerly preceded by the chanting of the seven penitential psalms by the clerks going along the street to the house which they were to visit, and by the erection of the crucifix in the direct view of the sick man, and by sprinkling him with holy water. (Proctor, p. 408.)

II.—ORDER OF THE SERVICE.

The Rubric directs that when any person is sick notice shall be given to the Minister of the parish, who, entering the house, shall pronounce the salutation "Peace" etc. Then, coming into the sick man's presence, he shall kneel and say the prayer "Remember not, Lord, our iniquities," etc. With the prayer and versicle which follow to the Exhortation, a second Exhortation is added, to be used in case the person be very sick. The English Rubric directs that the Exhortation shall be made according to the form prescribed or "such like." Our Rubric directs that it shall be said "after this form, *or otherlike*." The Minister is then directed to say the Creed; at the conclusion of which the sick man is to respond —"All this I steadfastly believe."

A Rubric which follows directs that the Minister shall examine whether the sick man is truly penitent for his sins, and in charity with those who have offended him, and is ready to confess and amend the injuries he has done to others. The Minister shall also admonish him to make his will and settle his affairs. Sick men of ability are to be earnestly moved to be liberal to the poor. The English Book has a Rubric which directs the sick person to be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matters; after which, if he humbly and heartily desire it, the priest shall pronounce his absolution.

That form of absolution is not conditional. It proceeds upon the assumption that the sick person has truly repented; and ends with the words, "By the authority committed to me I absolve thee from all thy sins." The Rubric and the absolution are omitted in our Book.

The Collect which follows "is in fact," says Proctor, "the original absolution or reconciliation of a dying penitent, found in the old formularies of the English Church, and in the Sacramentary of Gelasius." Unlike the Absolution, which is essentially Mediæval and Romish, the Collect, being throughout a supplication, has nothing in it that is objectionable. The Psalm which follows in the English Book is the LXXIst. We have substituted for it the *De Profundis* (CXXX.). Then follows the commendation of the sick man to God through Christ for safety and protection.

After this there are various prayers which may be used at discretion, to be closed with the benediction—"Unto God's gracious mercy," etc. The prayers are for a sick child; for a person when there appears but a small hope of his recovery; a commendatory prayer when the sick person is at the point of departure; and one for a person troubled in mind or conscience. We have added prayers for persons present at the visitation; for sudden surprise or immediate danger; and a thanksgiving for the beginning of recovery. These prayers are taken from Bishop Taylor.

Communion of the Sick.

I.—History of the Service.

The Rubric of 1549 directed that if the sick person was to receive the Communion on the same day in which it was celebrated in the Church, the Priest should reserve so much of the bread and wine as would be needful. The service then

to be used was the Confession, Absolution, the Comfortable Words, the distribution of the Elements and the Collect "Almighty and everlasting God," etc. But if there were no open Communion on that day, the Curate was directed to visit the sick person before noon and to administer the Communion by a brief service in which were included the present Epistle and Gospel. If more sick persons were to be visited in the same day, the Priest was to reserve a sufficient portion from the first consecration and immediately carry it and administer it to them.

At the revision in 1552, all mention of the reservation of the consecrated elements was omitted. The only change in the public service was the use of the special Collect, Epistle, and Gospel. At the revision of 1662 the number, "three or two at least," was mentioned as requisite to form a company of communicants with the sick person, and the present direction for shortening the service was given, by which, after the special Collect, Epistle, and Gospel, the Minister is to proceed to the address to the communicants: "Ye who do truly," etc.

The Puritans at the Savoy Conference objected to the administration of the Communion to all who *desired* it, and proposed that it should be done only in the case of those whom the Minister should judge truly penitent and fit to receive. The Bishops replied that it should be concluded, in the judgment of charity, in the case of every one who desired to receive, that he was truly penitent and prepared.

II.—THE RUBRIC.

The introductory Rubric states, as a reason why Ministers should exhort their congregations to the frequent reception of the Holy Communion, that they are liable to sudden sickness and death, and in that case they would have less cause to be disquieted for lack of its reception at their closing hours. But in case a sick person is unable to come to the

Church, and desires the Communion, it makes provision for the private administration of it, and directs that timely notice shall be given to the Minister of such desire, and of the number of persons (which shall be two or three at least) who are to communicate with the sick person.

After the special Collect, Epistle, and Gospel, a Rubric follows which directs that the Minister shall then proceed to the words "Ye who do truly," etc. Another Rubric directs that the Minister shall first receive the Communion himself; another declares that if the sick man be prevented, by any just impediment, from receiving the Sacrament, yet, if he be truly penitent, and steadfastly and thankfully believes in Christ's redemption, "he doth eat and drink the body and blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth." Another Rubric provides for the use of the Visitation service for the sick and the Communion for the sick at the same time, and directs that for the more expedition, the "Minister shall cut off the form of the Visitation at the Psalm, and go straight to the Communion." Another Rubric provides, that "in case of contagious sickness or disease, the Minister may communicate alone with the sick man."

III.—PROPRIETY OF THIS SERVICE.

"It hath been the constant usage of the Church, in all probability derived from Apostolic times, for persons dangerously sick, to receive the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, for their spiritual comfort and assistance. Hence this private Communion obtained the name of *viaticum* among the Latins, and a correspondent name among the Greeks, that is, provision laid in to sustain them in their journey to the other world. Our Church follows this example of the primitive ages. And rather than the sick man should

want so necessary a comfort, we are allowed to dispense it in a private house, and to a small company, which in other cases we avoid. Indeed, there are divers weighty reasons why the dying Christian should receive this Sacrament, and why Ministers should persuade them to it, and labor to fit them for the worthy receiving it. For—1. This is the highest mystery of religion, and fittest for those who by sickness are put in a heavenly frame, and are nearest to perfection. 2. This is God's seal of remission to all who receive it with penitence and faith. 3. This arms them against the fear of death, by setting Jesus before them who died for them, and hath pulled out the sting of death. 4. This declares they die in peace, and in the communion of the Catholic Church," in the confidence of a certain faith, in the comfort of a reasonable religious and holy hope, in favor with God, and in charity with all the world. (Bishop Brownell's Pr. Bk.)

IV.—THE DOCTRINAL DECLARATION OF THE THIRD RUBRIC.

This incidental but most explicit statement of the Rubric, to the effect that the sick man, being hindered from receiving the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, does yet, if he be penitent and believing, "eat and drink the body and blood of our Saviour Christ," is extremely valuable and important. It shows in what sense we receive that body and blood in the Sacrament itself. It furnishes an explanation (if indeed they need one) of all the expressions in the Communion Office. It is a service which was originally framed after the Communion Office and placed after it in the Prayer Book, and therefore furnishes an explanation of the sense in which the sacramental language of the Communion Office is used. It is introduced into a service used upon an occasion of the utmost solemnity, in which it is peculiarly incumbent upon the Church to make no careless and delusive statements.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE ORDER FOR THE BURIAL OF THE DEAD.

I.—THE FIRST RUBRIC.

THIS declares that the office is not to be used for any unbaptized adults, any who die excommunicate, or who have laid violent hands upon themselves. Our Rubric has added the word *adults*, which is not found in the English book. This Rubric was not inserted until the last review. "But it is not to be considered," says Shepherd, "a new law, but merely explanatory of the ancient Canon law, and of the previous usage in England." (Shepherd on C. P., 411.)

The interpretation which the law puts on this Rubric is definite: that Baptism by any hand, however irregular, is yet valid to secure the Church's rites of burial; excommunication is a punishment which can only be inflicted by the sentence of a competent tribunal; and the question of suicide is determined by the Coroner's inquest. (Proctor, 421. Stephens, 1708–12.)

The ground upon which Christian burial, as it is called, has been refused to these three classes of persons, is that they are not Christians. The unbaptized are regarded as those who have not become Christians, and the excommunicated and suicides as those who have ceased to be such. The service was constructed for those who were baptized in the Church, and its language is that of comfort and consolation in view of the death of those who have departed in the faith and love of God. The English office expresses the hope in every case, that the departed "*doth* rest" in Christ. There is therefore a manifest impropriety in using that office when

there can be no hope that the departed died in the true faith of Christ's Holy Name, where there is a conviction, on the contrary, that he died a reprobate or an unbeliever. The general principle of using the service for Christian Burial only in the case of those who are Christians, cannot be objected to, but it may well be doubted whether the present Rubric accomplishes the object either of *excluding* all but believers—all but those to whom the service *is* applicable, or of including all to whom it does in fact apply. A person who is baptized may become a reprobate and an infidel, and yet, according to the Rubric, the service could and should be used in his case. A person sincerely anxious to follow all the will of God may not have been baptized, under the conviction that Baptism was not designed by our Lord to be a permanent institution of the Church, and yet may die in full faith in Christ, and with the exhibition of all the evidences of Christian character—the fruits by which a true faith is known—and yet the Rubric forbids the service in this case to be used. It may be said, indeed, that it is impossible always to discern the inner state of men, either by their conduct or their professions, and that, therefore, only external evidences can be relied upon, and that in the judgment of charity, all who are baptized are presumed to be persons who should receive Christian burial. But it is not judgment of charity, it is not reliance upon external evidence, but a defiance of it—it is the abnegation of all judgment—to conclude that a baptized person who dies, for instance, in a drunken brawl, doth rest in Christ. It cannot be a judgment of charity that he who refuses to honor the Sabbath, and attend the worship of God, and to commemorate the Saviour's death, is a Christian brother dying in the faith of Christ, because he was baptized when an unconscious infant.

It would seem therefore that this Rubric does not accomplish the purpose, either of excluding those to whom the

service is not applicable, or of including those to whom it is. And if it be said that it would be impossible to construct a rule which would absolutely include only those to whom the service is applicable, the truth of the remark may be admitted; and yet I think it may be shown that a rule could be constructed which would prevent the painful anomaly of pronouncing words of Christian hope over the notoriously reprobate and abandoned, and which would yet allow their burial with such consolations for Christian friends as would be possible in such a case, and would at the same time allow the Minister to perform such services as would be suitable in the case of the unbaptized dead who have exhibited the fruits of the Spirit in their lives, and have died in the true faith of Christ's holy name.

Our Church has omitted the phrase "As our hope is this our brother doth"—*i. e.*, rest in Christ—and this, so far as it goes, is no doubt an improvement in the service; and a relief from the sense of incongruity of the use of the service in the case of those who have lived Godless lives and died shameful deaths. But by retaining the Rubric concerning the unbaptized and the suicide, she has expressed, equally with the English Church, her conviction that her Burial services should be used only for those who are Christians; and the remaining parts of the service, being unchanged, proceed upon the assumption that they are true and faithful believers. The change, therefore, while it has removed one objectionable feature in the Burial service, which, if it were present, would trouble many consciences, as it does in the Church of England, leaves the general objection to the principle upon which it is constructed—or rather to the application of that principle—unchanged.

If there were a Rubric declaring that this service should be used only in the case of those who were communicants of the Church at the time of their death, and if another brief and

general form were constructed for the case of those who were not in the Communion of the Church, then there would be no wound inflicted upon the hearts of the friends of the deceased, and the frequent painful anomaly and inappropriateness of the present service would be avoided; and in the service at the house, or at the grave, this brief service could be so supplemented, when needful in peculiar cases, as to be appropriate to the living, and not injurious to the memory of the dead.

As Excommunication is not identical with suspension from the Communion, but is the sentence of an Ecclesiastical court; and as we have no court in our Church to pronounce the sentence of Excommunication; it would seem that the word has been retained unadvisedly in our office; and that it would not be lawful, under this Rubric, to refuse to bury a baptized person who had been suspended.

The English Courts have decided that idiots and lunatics and persons otherwise of unsound mind who deprive themselves of life are not included under the words "that have laid violent hands upon themselves." In the absence of any such decision in our Church, and of any Court to make it, the reasons upon which it rests are so obviously just, that it may properly be adopted as a rule in such cases. (Stephens, Pr. Bk. p. 1711.)

II.—THE SECOND RUBRIC.

This Rubric directs that the Minister, meeting the corpse at the entrance of the Church-yard, and going before it either into the Church or toward the grave, shall say or sing the Anthem that follows.

1. *Attendance at the House of the Deceased.*—The Rubric was intended to relieve the Minister from the obligation to attend at the house of the deceased, and accompany the corpse

all the way to the place of burial. It was originally provided in an Injunction of Edward VI. that, "Forasmuch as priests be public ministers of the Church, they shall not be bound to fetch any corpse before it be brought to the Church-yard." (Cardwell's Doc. Annals, 2, § 30.) But the custom has now become so general, in cases where the corpse is carried to the grave-yard immediately from the house, for the minister to be present there, that an Office of Devotion to be used at the house has been set forth by some Bishops; and the failure to appear, and to accompany the corpse to the grave, would be offensive, and, therefore, unadvisable.

2. *Vestment of the officiating Minister.*—The Rubric does not specify the vestment to be used by the Minister at the Burial Service. But, inasmuch as a Canon of the English Church (68) provides that every Minister "ministering the Sacraments or *other rites of the Church*" shall wear a surplice, the general custom in that country, in accordance with the Canon, is for the Minister to officiate at funerals in the surplice. Although we have no such Canon, the surplice is, with propriety, generally worn when the Burial Service is performed in the Church, and may, without impropriety, be worn when the burial is to take place from the house, both there and at the grave. The more frequent custom, however, is that of wearing the gown at the house and at the grave.

3. *The Sentences.*—Our Rubric directs the *Ministers* to say or sing the sentences which follow. The English Rubrics direct that they shall be said by the "priest and clerks." By the clerks are meant the clerical and lay members of choirs in Cathedrals and the assistant Ministers in parishes. "It would appear by the wording of the Rubric that when the introductory sentences are not sung, they ought to be repeated alternately or simultaneously by priests and clerks." (Stephens' Pr. Bk., p. 1713.) In the Sarum Use these sen-

tences are directed to be said antiphonally. (Proctor, p. 421.) Wheatley observes that in many parts of England, in his day, the custom still prevailed of the singing of psalms from the house to the very entrance of the Church-yard, in order to divert the grief of the friends and mourners, and in conformity with the ancient custom of singing hallelujahs as the friends of departed Christians conveyed them to their graves. (Wheatley, p. 477.) These sentences are exceedingly appropriate and consoling.

At the Savoy Conference the Presbyterian Ministers "desired that the Ministers be left to use their own discretion in these circumstances, and to perform the whole service in the Church, if they think fit, for the preventing of those inconveniences which many times both Minister and people are exposed unto by standing in the open air."

To which the Bishops replied: "It is not fit that so much should be left to the discretion of every Minister; and the desire that all may be said in the Church, being not pretended to be for the ease of tender consciences, but of tender heads, may be helped by a cap better than a Rubric." (English Puritanism. Documents, pp. 143, 173.)

III.—THE PSALM.

"In the English Service the 39th and 90th Psalms are given entire, the Rubric leaving it to the Minister to use one or both of them at his discretion. Here we have the most appropriate parts of both collected into an Anthem." (Bishop Brownell.)

"The 39th Psalm is supposed to have been composed by David, upon Joab reproaching him for his public grief for Absalom's death; and it is of use in this place to comfort those that mourn, to check all loud and unseemly complaints, and to turn them into prayers and devout meditations.

"The 90th Psalm was composed by Moses in the wilderness upon the death of that vast multitude who, for their murmuring and infidelity, were sentenced to leave their carcasses in the wilderness, and who accordingly wasted, little by little, before they came into the land of Canaan." (Wheatley.)

These two Psalms were inserted in the service in 1662, together with the Lesson which was ordered to be read.

IV.—THE LESSON.

"Since the faith of the Resurrection is not only the principal article of a Christian's belief, but also the article which chiefly concerns us on this occasion (as well to allay our sorrow for the party deceased, as to prepare us freely to follow him when God shall call us), therefore the Church hath chosen here the fullest account of the resurrection of the dead that the whole Scripture affords; that article being here so strongly proved, so plainly described, and so pertinently applied, that nothing could be more suitable to the present purpose; for this reason we find it has always been used in this Office of the Church." (Wheatley, p. 481.)

V.—THE ANTHEM AT THE GRAVE.

The sentences of which this Anthem is composed are taken, in great measure, from the old offices. The first (Job xiv. 1, 2) was part of a Lection in the Office of the Dead. The second, third, and fourth are formed from an Antiphon which was sung at Compline during Lent.

Upon this ancient Anthem Luther composed a German hymn, which again led to the composition of the latter part of this Anthem—"O Holy Lord God, O Holy Mighty God, O Holy Merciful Saviour, thou God eternal, suffer us not to fall from the consolation of *true faith*." Archbishop

Laurence (Bampton Lectures, p. 381) observes that this fixes the meaning of the expression in the Anthem, "Suffer us not at our last hour for any pains of death to *fall from thee*." These words, therefore, cannot bear the Calvinistic interpretation that they relate to a fall from a fictitious or *ideal faith*. Compare also the Bishop's Book: "Keep us that the devil by no suggestion bring us from the right faith, neither cause us to fall into desperation now nor in the point of death." (Proctor (*note*), p. 423.)

VI.—THE COMMITTAL TO THE EARTH.

The Rubric declares that while the earth shall be cast upon the body by some one standing by, the Minister shall say the words which follow. The First Book of Edward directed that the casting of the earth upon the coffin should be done by the Minister himself. The present Rubric is practically so interpreted as to allow the sexton or the bearers to cast three small portions of earth upon the coffin when the Minister repeats the words, "earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust."

In the Committal of the First Book the expression occurred, "I commend thy soul to God, the Father Almighty, and thy body to the ground." The present English Service uses this language: "Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God of his great mercy *to take unto himself* the soul of our dear brother," etc. The expression "to take unto himself" was objected to at the Savoy Conference, as likely to be regarded as an explicit declaration, in regard to all over whom the Service is used, that they have gone to rest in God, and that the theory of the Judgment of Hope and Charity cannot be properly applied to a declaration which is so positive. Our Service has changed the expression into the unobjectionable phrase, "that it hath pleased Almighty God to *take out of this world* the soul of our deceased brother."

VII.—THE ANTHEM AND THE PRAYERS.

The anthem (Rev. xiv. 13), which may be either said or sung, is found in ancient offices of the Western Church, and in the Use of Sarum. But the prayers which conclude the service are the composition of the Reformers, and differ from those in the Mediæval offices in having reference only to the living instead of the dead, whose doom is fixed. The former prayer contemplates the whole company present, and the latter has special reference to the mourners, and each contains petitions appropriate to the special needs of those for whom the prayer is offered. We have omitted the phrase, in the second prayer, "as our hope is this our brother doth" (*i. e.*, rest in Christ).

VIII.—PRAYER FOR THE DEAD.

The changes made in this office, in the English Book, and still more emphatically in our own, prove a fixed purpose, on the part of those who respectively revised the services, to exclude all prayers for the dead. After the lesson, in King Edward's first Liturgy, then followed several versicles, and a prayer which, with modifications, forms the first of the two concluding prayers. In its first form it is throughout a prayer for the departed. It supplicates God that the sins which he has committed in this world may not be imputed unto him, that he may rise with the just and righteous, and enter with them into the heavenly kingdom.

Wheatley evidently regrets that this change was made in the service, and contends that the sentence which is still left standing, "we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of God's holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss in body and soul," *is*, in fact, a prayer for the dead. He says that it is not barely a supposition that all those who are so departed *will* have their perfect consummu-

tion and bliss, but a prayer also that they *may* have it, viz., that *we with them and they with us* may be made perfect together, both in body and soul, in the eternal and everlasting glory of God."

If this interpretation of the grammatical sense of the expression be correct, it proves that those who changed the service did not accomplish what they intended, for it is clear that they designed to exclude all prayers for the dead. The clear and explicit petitions for the dead are excluded. It is not to be supposed, when such is well known to have been their intention, that they could have designedly left an equivocal expression, under cover of which prayers for the dead might still be offered.

But the interpretation is evidently incorrect. The prayer begins with thanks to God for those who are in joy and felicity, and then continues with the supplication that we, with them, *i. e.*, with those who already rest in Christ, and whose perfect consummation of bliss in body and soul is now made sure because of their present joy and felicity, may at the resurrection enjoy the complete and finished blessedness of the righteous.

Bishop Cosin and Bishop Overall (Wheatley, p. 482) have contended, that, although this be not a prayer for the faithful that they may enter into joy and felicity, it is yet a prayer that they may have the perfect consummation of bliss in soul and body at the resurrection. But as that result is sure in the case of those who are already in felicity, and as it is not yet certain in the case of those who are still upon probation, and as the prayer is for the latter, that they may share in the certain glory of the former, it is inconceivable that we should be called upon, in the midst of an unfinished prayer for the one class, who need the petition, to have our minds confused by a parenthetical petition for another class of persons, who do not need it, and for whom, therefore, it is not applicable.

CHAPTER IX.

THE CHURCHING OF WOMEN; PRAYERS TO BE USED AT SEA, FOR THE VISITATION OF PRISONERS, FOR THANKSGIVING, AND FOR FAMILIES; THE ARTICLES; AND THE ORDINAL.

The Thanksgiving of Women after Childbirth, commonly called the Churching of Women.

I.—THE RUBRICS.

The first Rubric, which is not found in the English Book, contains a provision that either the whole service, or the concluding prayer alone, may be used. Neither the service nor the prayer is often used in our Church. The custom may be regarded as obsolete.

The second Rubric directs that the woman shall come into the Church decently apparelled, and shall kneel at some convenient place as has been accustomed, or as the Ordinary shall direct. The usual custom was for the woman to appear at the chancel rail, or where it was customary to receive the Communion. There is no direction as to the time at which the service shall be introduced. The custom in this particular has therefore been various. It has been introduced before and after the General Thanksgiving at the end of the second lesson, and at other portions of the service.

The Rubric at the end of the service provides that an accustomed offering shall be made. This offering in the English Church was appropriated to the Minister. Our reviewers have directed that it shall be devoted to the relief of distressed women in childbed.

II.—THE SERVICE.

"This service of Thanksgiving is of very ancient use in the Christian Church, and is derived from the Jewish rite of purification. It was called *the order of purification* in the First Book; but this title was altered in 1552, to prevent misconstruction.

The address was prefixed to the other portions of the service which were taken from the Sarum Use. The Psalms were appointed in 1662. We have omitted one of the two Psalms which are in the English Book.

Forms of Prayer to be used at Sea.

In the English Book the next service in order is that of "A Commination or denouncing of God's anger and judgments against sinners, with certain prayers, to be used on the first day of Lent, and at other times as the Ordinary shall appoint. We have very properly omitted this service.

"The forms of prayer to be used at sea were first inserted in the English Book at the last review. They have been adopted in ours, with only a few verbal alterations, occasioned chiefly by a difference of political institutions. It will be perceived that with the exception of the first two Collects, which are discretionary, they are all *occasional* services—the common Morning and Evening Service being appointed to be used daily at sea. They are so appropriate and so simple in themselves as to require no comments." "It must have been from oversight," says Bishop White, "that the word *Minister*, designating the person who is to pronounce the Absolution, which had been used here and elsewhere in the *Proposed Book*, was not changed to *priest*, as it hath been in other parts of the Liturgy." (Bishop Brownell.)

Forms of Prayer for the Visitation of Prisoners, for Thanksgiving, and for use in Families.

The English Liturgy contains no forms for the Visitation of prisoners. Ours is taken from "The Irish Book of Common Prayer," in which it is set forth as "treated upon by the Archbishops and Bishops, and the rest of the clergy of Ireland, and agreed upon by her Majesty's license, in their Synod, holden at Dublin, in the year 1771." (Bishop Brownell.)

The first Rubric provides for a change of the anthem, and for the addition of two Collects to the Collect for the day. The next Rubric directs the method of service in the Visitation of a prisoner confined for a great or capital crime.

From a Rubric in the service, in which the prisoner is exhorted to a particular confession of the sin for which he is condemned, in connection with another Rubric which follows, and which provides that the Priest shall declare to him the pardoning mercy of God, in the form which is used in the Communion Service, it has been argued that private confession and absolution are sanctioned, and may, therefore be adopted in the case of other sins. But there is a very great difference between the custom of a confession of sins, periodically on the part of those who are in Communion with the Church, and the confession of a great crime on the part of one who is under sentence of death, as evidence of the sincerity of his repentance, and with a view to instruct him as to the satisfaction that he should make in order that he may be admitted or restored to the Communion of the Church. Besides the propriety of this confession, as a needful warrant to the Minister that he is authorized so to admit or restore him to Communion, it is in the Rubric urged upon the ground of duty to the community, in order that "any combinations in wickedness, or any evil practices designed against others,"

may thus be "discovered and prevented." And, moreover, the form referred to in the Communion Office is not called an Absolution, and has nothing of the character of an authoritative priestly Absolution, but is a simple authorized declaration of God's forgiving mercy to the penitent and believing.

It may be added that the changes introduced into the office for the Communion of the Sick are evidences of the purpose of the framers of our service to exclude private confessions and absolutions. If such a practice be lawful and expedient in the case of those who are in health, it must be much more so in the case of the sick, who may be drawing near to death. And yet our Book has omitted the Rubric to the effect that the sick man "shall be moved to make special confession of his sins if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matters;" and has removed the form of absolution by which such confession was followed.

The form of Thanksgiving was prepared in 1785, and printed in the Proposed Book. The family prayers were taken, with slight alterations, from Bishop Gibson.

Articles of Religion.

Bishop White states, in his Memoirs, that, after repeated discussions and propositions, it had been found that the doctrines of the Gospel as contained in the XXXIX. Articles of the Church of England, with the exception of such matters as are local, were more likely to give general satisfaction than the same doctrines in any new form that might be devised. The former were, therefore, "adopted by the two houses of Convention without their altering of even the obsolete diction in them, but with notices of such changes as change of situation had rendered necessary. Exclusively of such there is but one exception, that of adopting the Article concerning the Creeds, to the former exclusion of the Athanasian."

The Ordinal.

1. *Changes in the Preface.*—The preface remains, with a few modifications, the same as in the English Book. The declaration that no man shall be accounted a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, in the *Church of England*, unless ordained or consecrated according to the Ordinal, or unless he has previously received Episcopal ordination or consecration, is changed in our Book to the declaration that he shall not be accounted such in *this Church*. The English preface declares that none shall be admitted a Deacon, unless he have a faculty, under 23 years of age; nor Priest, under 24 years; nor Bishop, under 30 years of age. A faculty or dispensation in the case of deacons, may be granted for persons of extraordinary abilities, by the Archbishop of Canterbury. But there can be no dispensation for the admission to the priesthood of a person under twenty-four years of age. This is prohibited by statute. The English preface further provides that the Bishop, ascertaining "that the candidate is of virtuous conversation and learned in the Latin tongue, and sufficiently instructed in the Holy Scriptures, may ordain him, at the times appointed in the Canon, or on urgent occasions, on some other Sunday or Holy Day."

Our preface declares that none shall be admitted Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, except he be of the age which the Canon, in that case provided, may require. It also modifies the qualifications for the diaconate, declaring that the Bishop may admit the candidate when he finds him "sufficiently instructed in Holy Scripture, and otherwise learned, as the Canons may require."

2. *The Three Orders.*—By the word "orders" is evidently meant three distinct *classes* of ministers. The order of Bishops is as distinctly a class above that of Priests, as that of Priests is above that of Deacons. The Bishop is not to

be regarded as of the same order with the Priest, endowed with additional powers, any more than a Priest is to be regarded as of the same order with Deacons, having also some additional powers. The construction of the sentence makes this interpretation necessary, and the Office for the Consecration of a Bishop confirms it.

3. *From the Apostles' Times.*—This somewhat vague expression appears to have been intended to avoid the statement of any more explicit theory of Episcopacy than that it is found to have been an existing institution in the times of the Apostles. Whether it were established by the explicit direction of Christ, or by inspiration after his ascension; whether the Episcopate is the same office as the Apostolate; and whether it is necessary to the existence of the Ministry and the validity of its ministrations, is not here expressed. The advocates of various theories claim that they are in harmony with the general expressions of the preface.

4. *This Church.*—The moderation of the Church in this preface appears further from the fact that it declares that no person who has not been ordained according to the Ordinal, or has not received Episcopal ordination or consecration, shall be accounted a lawful Bishop, priest, or deacon in *this Church.* She does not declare that such persons shall not be regarded, or cannot become, lawful Ministers of Christ in other Churches. The preface to the Prayer Book appears to recognize the existence of other Churches when it speaks of other religious denominations as "left at full liberty to model and organize *their respective Churches.*"

CHAPTER X.

CONSECRATION OF A CHURCH OR CHAPEL, AND INSTITUTION OF MINISTERS INTO PARISHES OR CHURCHES.

Consecration of a Church or Chapel.

This office is substantially the same as that composed by Bishop Andrews in the reign of James the First. It is generally used, although modified at will, by the English Bishops, in such consecrations, but it has never been authorized by Convocation or Parliament. It was adopted in the General Convention of 1799. (Perry's Half Century, etc., Vol. 1, p. 237.)

An Office of Institution of Ministers into Parishes.

In addition to this general title the following statement is made: "Prescribed by the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, established in General Convention of the Bishops, the clergy and laity 1804, and set forth with alterations in General Convention 1808."

I.—INSTITUTION AND INDUCTION IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

1. *Institution.*—When a clerk has been presented to a living he is instituted into the Rectorship of the Church by the Bishop of the diocese, or by his Chancellor or Commissary, upon making the required subscription to the Articles, and taking the prescribed oaths of canonical obedience. By the Institution he can hold his place and enjoy the resources of

the parish, against the appointment by the patron of another clerk, until he shall be removed by due course of law. By Institution the care of souls is committed to him, and he enters upon the glebe and takes the tithes, but he cannot let, or grant, or sue for them.

If the Bishop refuse to institute a clerk on alleged legal grounds (heresy, drunkeness, bastardy), the clerk may apply for a remedy to the Ecclesiastical Courts.

2. *Induction.*—The difference between Institution and Induction in the English Church is thus described (Johnson's Clergyman's *Vade Mecum*, p. 85): "By induction the clerk is complete incumbent, and has a right *ad beneficium*, as by Institution he had right *ad officium*, and that he may retain both he must strictly observe the directions of certain statutes as follows," etc. These statutes require his subscription to the Articles, his reading of the whole service in the Church within two months after his Induction, and some other similar proceedings. By Institution he has the right and is bound to perform the public services of the Church, and is put in possesssion of its temporalities, but he cannot personally and legally "let, or grant, or sue for them," until after induction.*

* The full ceremonies upon induction are quite quaint and peculiar, but, as will be seen by the following account, capable of much modification in certain changed conditions and emergencies.

"Induction is commonly performed by some neighboring clergyman, who, taking the hand of the person to be inducted, lays it on the key of the Church, which is then in the door, and says: 'By virtue of this instrument (meaning the Archdeacon's or other Ordinary or visitor's warrant, which he holds in his hand, or puts into the handle of the key) I induct you into the real, actual, and corporal possession of the Rectory or Vicarage of N., with all its fruits, profits, members, and appurtenances.' Which said, he opens the door and puts the Rector in possession of the Church and shuts the door upon him, who, after he has tolled a bell, if there be any belonging to the Church, comes out, and desires the clergyman who inducted him to endorse a certificate of his induc-

II.—INSTITUTION IN THE CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES.

1. *History of the Office.*—Inasmuch as clergymen were inducted into benefices during our Colonial condition, in order that they might be legally entitled to, and claim their temporalities, it was natural that the Church after the Revolution should feel that a similar proceeding was necessary to give a fixity of tenure to their Rectorships, and to enable them to claim and secure their salaries or endowments.

The general system which prevailed during colonial days was, the right of presentation by the vestry or the parish, and induction by the Governor. (Hoffman on the Law of the Church, p. 290.)

In the General Convention of 1804, a Canon was proposed, making an addition to the XVIIth Canon of 1789, entitled "Notice to be given of the Induction and Dismission of Ministers," which was adopted. An Office of Induction was also prepared and adopted, and one thousand copies of it were ordered to be printed. (Perry's Half Century, etc., Vol. 1, pp. 296, 297, 298, 302, 308, 313, 321.)

The Canon enforcing the use of this office contains the

tion on the Archdeacon's warrant, and all that were present to testify it under their hands.

"But the clerk need not be solicitous concerning the ceremony or formality of the induction. If the Church key cannot be had, it is sufficient that the clerk take hold of the ringle of the door. If the Church be ruinated it is enough to lay the hand upon the wall, or if there be no wall, on the fence of the Church-yard; and in case the key cannot be had, it is held sufficient that the clerk did, within the time limited (two months), read the Common Prayer and Thirty-nine Articles in the Church porch: only it is fit that the induction should be as public as may be, so that the parishioners, and all that have or may pretend a right to the patronage (who are to take notice of it to their peril), may have no reason to say that it was done clandestinely; therefore, the tolling of the bell is no insignificant ceremony." (Vade Mecum, p. 84.)

following provision: "No Minister who shall be hereafter elected into any parish or Church shall be considered as a regularly admitted and settled parochial Minister, in any diocese or State, or shall, as such, have any vote in the choice of a Bishop, until he shall have been inducted according to the office prescribed by the Church."

In the General Convention of 1808, the following Resolutions were passed:—

(1) *Resolved*, That the title of the office of Induction be changed to "office of Institution."

(2) *Resolved*, That the following Rubric be prefixed to the letter of Institution in said office.

"In any State or Diocese the concluding paragraph in the letter of Institution may be omitted, where it interferes with the usages, laws, or charters of the Church in the same."

(3) *Resolved*, That in the first Rubric the words as prescribed by the 1st Canon be changed, and the word *shall* be changed to *may*.

By this action of the Convention, it appears that objections had been made to the Office on the ground that it conflicted, or might conflict, with some of the usages, charters, or laws of some of the Dioceses, and on the ground that its use seemed to be made obligatory. Both of these difficulties were met by this action of the Convention.

Bishop White was not in favor of this office, and makes the following remarks in reference to it in his note on the Convention of 1808. "It is to be hoped that the consequences of the measure will be an illustration of the maxim, that the art of governing consists, in great measure, in not governing too much. No objection had been made to the office, but the requiring of Induction as essential to a valid settlement was evidently perceived to militate against the idea, so prevalent in many places, of dismissing ministers at pleasure. Now, although there can hardly be any principle more evidently hostile to the permanent respectability of the ministry, yet it would have been better to have left the correction of it to time and attendant inconvenience, than to

have brought the full force of it into operation by the measure in question. Certainly it would have been best to have rested the service on a recommendatory Rubric. In Maryland the measure interfered directly with the vestry law. From Carolina there was a memorial desiring an alteration of the Canon. And in other places, complaints were known to have been made. On the other hand, the service and the result of it were, with great reason so acceptable, that they refused to concur in doing away with the former measure, but consented to dispensing with it in those States or Dioceses in which it interfered with charters or usages. In this shape the matter was brought before the Bishops, who were reluctant to the saying of anything liable to be construed into an approbation of charters or usages which they hold to be contrary to good order in the Church. Still, the consequences of rejecting the Canon were so stated to them as to induce, on their part, the consenting to it, with a subjoined declaration that it should not be construed as giving a sanction to the charters and usages in contemplation, concerning which they also expressed the hope that they will, in time, be altered. This amendment was accepted, and the Canon passed." (Bishop White's Memoirs, pp. 195–6.)

In the Convention of 1820 the following action in reference to this service was taken:—

Resolved, That the Book of Common Prayer be distinguished from the Book of Psalms in Metre, the Articles of Religion, and sundry Offices set forth by this Church, viz.: the Form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; the Form of Consecration of a Church or Chapel; a prayer to be used at the meetings of Convention; an *Office of Institution* of Ministers or Churches,—all of which *are of equal authority* with the Book of Common Prayer." (Perry, etc., Vol. 1, pp. 557–8.)

2. *Legal Authority of this Office.*—By the action of the Convention of 1808, the Office was made permissive. It was no longer obligatory. Dr. Hawks considered that the terms Induction and Institution were regarded as synonymous by the Conventions of 1804 and 1808. But we have seen how important the distinction between these offices is in the

Church of England, and if they were synonymous it is difficult to conceive why the change was made. He considered, that it still remained the method in which the right to the temporalities, and especially to the control of the Church edifice, is to be obtained, and he pressed the importance of the office being observed with a view to this point."

Judge Hoffman, on the other hand, holds, "that the call itself (which should always be in writing), with the occupation of the Church and performance of the duties in it, would entitle the clergyman to every right and authority which he would possess by usage or civil or Canonical law, had the office of induction been used, or the word induct employed in the written call." (Hoffman, Law of the Church, p. 291.)

But some have contended that the office has no place in the Prayer Book at all, and that, therefore, its use is not even permissible. This argument is grounded upon the fact that it has not been conformed to the requisition of the VIIIth Article of the Constitution, which "provides that no alteration or addition shall be made in the Book of Common Prayer *or other Offices of the Church* or Articles of Religion, unless the same shall be proposed in one General Convention, and by a resolve made known to the Convention of every Diocese, adopted at the subsequent General Convention." It is well known that such action was not taken in the case of the Institution Office. But that provision of the Constitution was not introduced until the General Convention of 1811, and therefore was not obligatory in 1808. It stands on the same footing as an office of the Church (though permissive only) as do the Ordinal and the other services mentioned, in the resolution of the General Convention of 1820, as "of equal authority with the Book of Common Prayer."

3. *Objections urged Against this Service.*—It is urged against this office that in its terms it seems to convey rights which are not recognized by our laws, and which are in con-

flict with the usages, charters, and laws of some of the Churches. If no other rights, and no surer tenure of an incumbency, and no more certain claim upon the temporalities of the Church are secured to an instituted than to an elected Rector, it seems, to say the least, that it is inexpedient to adopt a service which is of real force in the Mother Church of England, but does not, in the opinion of Judge Hoffman, and many others, in the least degree increase the Rector's prerogatives and rights.

But more serious objection has been made to the phraseology of this Office, which contains words—such as *Altar*, and *sacerdotal*—which have been carefully excluded from all our other services. As illustrative of the history of this service I append the following communication which appeared in the Church paper, the "Episcopalian," in 1864. No one who recognizes the initials* of the communication will for a moment doubt its accuracy.

"EDITOR EPISCOPALIAN: Your correspondent S. X., speaking of the word 'altar' as applied to the LORD'S TABLE, cites the fact that it is used in the Institution Office, and says that the insertion of that office 'may be regarded as especially expressive of the judgment of our own Church as to the lawfulness of the term.'

"More than twenty years ago, being in company with the late Bishop H. U. Onderdonk at the consecration of a Church at Carbondale, Pennsylvania, Bishop O. spoke of the fact that the only place in the Prayer Book where the word was thus employed was in the Institution Office, and he said that it was due to the truth of history to state an occurrence of which he had been a witness. He then went on to say, that after the institution of the Rev. John A. Clark, as Rector of St. Andrew's Church, the venerable Bishop White, the father of the American Episcopal Church, on leaving the Chancel, exclaimed aloud, '*Altar! Altar! Altar! I did not see this word in the office, or it should never have been put in the Prayer Book.*'

---

* R. B. C.

"To those who reflect that the House of Bishops in 1808, when this office was established, consisted only of Bishops White and Claggett (the other three Bishops, Jarvis, Moore, and Madison, being absent), there will appear but little doubt that Bishop White's overlooking the word alone prevented its exclusion from this office. The fact that everywhere else in the Prayer Book it has been rigorously excluded is evidence enough that the founders of the Episcopal Church in this land regarded its use as inexpedient, if not absolutely improper. There is, certainly, no reason to impugn the churchmanship of the clergy and laity who prefer the Scriptural term 'the Lord's Table,' to the Romish name 'Altar.'"

In bringing this work to a close, I take the opportunity to add to what is said in the preface, that I publish it with the hope that some of my Brethren of the Clergy—and especially the younger Clergy—may find in this single small volume an answer to some of the many questions which the times have originated or renewed, which could not otherwise be readily resolved without a considerable Liturgical library. I may add also that the laity of the Church, and those more particularly who hold office in Churches or Church Institutions, are under solemn obligations to inquire into the truth of doctrines and the lawfulness of practices which claim their acceptance, on the authority of vague so-called Catholic tradition, and of Liturgies of the Mother Church, or of other Churches, which are neither our liberty nor our law.

INDEX.

ABSOLUTION, rubric before, 162
by whom to be pronounced, 162, 166
Act of Parliament authorizing Second Book of Edward VI., its purport, 26
Act of Uniformity prescribes a fixed service, 97
Advertisements of 1565, 45
legal force of, 48, 53
Alasco, John, his Church in London, 19
Albs forbidden by Second Book of Edward VI., 46
Altar cloths sanctioned, 107
Altar lights forbidden, 103
Altars, stone, condemned, 107
Amen, the, 172
Apparel, ordinary, of the clergy, 45
in Church ministrations, 46
Arians of Spain, 184
Articles of Religion, 280
of inquiry in 1547, 2, 3
prohibiting superstitious ceremonies in the Communion, 14

BACON, Lord, view of the Prayer Book, 61
Baptism, public, of infants, 234
to be performed in Church, 234
on Sundays and Holy Days, 235
private, 240
of those of riper years, 241
lay, 236
its validity, 237
certification in the Church, 237
its right performance, 237
by a lawful minister, 237
essential parts of, 238
Baptism—
certificate of, 240, 241
lawful ministration of, 241
Baptismal office, changes in our Book, 235
Behavior in Church, 180, 182
Benedicite, the, 102
Benedictus, 178
Bishops, the English, and our Prayer Book, 88
Bowing at the name of Jesus, 180, 182
Bread and wine, when to be placed upon the Table, 216
Bread, what kind to be used, 216
Bucer appointed professor, 19
Bully's Variations, 37
Burial of the dead, order for, 267
of unbaptized, suicides, and excommunicated, denied, 267
attendance at the house, 270
vestment of the officiating minister at, 271
sentences, how to be said, 271
office, objected to by the Presbyterian divines, 272
the lesson at, 273
anthem at the grave, 273
committal to the earth, 274
anthem and prayers, 275

CALENDAR, the new, 43
Calvin, 19
Canterbury, Convocation of, A.D. 1550, 18
Catechism, its origin, 244
Cranmer's, 5
Poynet's and Nowell's, 245
Ceremonies in Durham Cathedral, 232

Changes in Edward VI.'s First Book, importance of, 24
in the Second Book of Edward VI., 246
Charles II., declaration of, A. D. 1660, 69
Child, in Baptism, dipped or sprinkled, 239
Choral service not sanctioned in the American Church, 169
Chrism, and Chrisom, 239
Chrysostom, prayer of, 188
Churches, the Continental, recognized, 19
Collects, the five, at the close of the Communion office, 226
the, 207
for the day, peace, and grace, 185
before the Lord's Prayer, 213
before the sermon, 213
Comfortable words, the, 220
Commandments, the Ten, 205
Commonwealth, Prayer Book and Church during the, 67
Communicants, their position, 218
Communion, order of the, 3
early, 212
of the sick, office of the, 263
frequency of, 226
Communion Table, desecration of, 183
its position, 108, 109
Conference of Hampton Court, 56
first day of, 57
second day, 58
third day, 59
results of, 60,
comments upon, 70, 72
Conference of Savoy, 69
reasons of its failure, 70, 71
Confession, the general, 160, 161, 194
private, 194
the, in Communion office, 219
Confirmation, meaning and origin of, 246
age and qualifications for, 247
history of the service of, 248
Consecration, Scotch prayer of, 222
second, of the elements, 225
of a Church or Chapel, office of, 283
Convocation of 1562, 44
its proposed reforms, 45
Copes forbidden by Second Book of Edward VI., 46
Council, Second, of Constantinople, 184
of Bracara, 184
of Toledo, 184
Covering of the Communion Table, 198
Cranmer's early opinions on the Eucharist, 56
Credence Tables lawful, 107
Creed, the Nicene, 184
the Apostles', 179
Cross, the, admitted, 107
in Churches, 200

DAILY service, not obligatory, 148
Directorium Anglicanum, 100
Directory of public worship, 68
Dissenters, movements for relief of, 74
Divines, leading, desire revision of the Liturgy, 79
reformed, who remained in England during Queen Mary's reign, 27
who fled to the Continent, 27
Doxology, 173

EAST, the, turning to, 183
Eastern position advocated, on what grounds, 110
Eastern position not practised in XVIIth century, 111
arguments for, answered, 112
to order the elements only, 114
not for the whole service, 114
sanctioned by Court of Arches, 114
condemned by Judicial Committee, 115
sanctioned, 221
Ebury, Lord, bills of, for revision, 81
Edward VI. desired further changes in the Prayer Book, 17
Elevation of the cup forbidden, 105
Elizabeth, Queen, her position, 31
her first proceedings, 32

Ember Weeks and Days, 188, 189
Epact, the, 146
Epistles, the, 207
Excommunication, not known in the American Church, 270
Exeter, Bishop of, on practices forbidden, 101
Exhortation, the, 160
of Baptismal office, 237
preceding Communion, 218
at celebration, 218
in the Baptismal service, 232

FAGIUS appointed professor, 19
Fasting-communion, 217
Filioque, when introduced, 184
Folkstone Ritual Case, 221
Fonts, position of in the Church, 231
Frankfort, troubles at, 27

GARDINER, Bishop, objections of, to the Homilies, 3
Gloria Patri, 173
Godfathers and Godmothers, 235
in the Primitive Church, 236
Golden number, the, 145
Gospels, the, 208
Guest's agency in revision of the Elizabethan Prayer Book, 34

HABITS, controversy concerning, 12, 14
Hallam, on toleration, 61, 62
Hats, worn in Church, 183
Hawks, Dr., on the Prayer Book, 126
Holy Communion, office of, 194
formerly called the Liturgy, 194
Holy Days to be observed, 209
Homilies, First Book of, 1
Second Book of, 45
Hooper, his refusal to be consecrated in the habits, 15
Hour-glass, when disused, 213
Huntington Dr., on the future of the Prayer Book, 135, 136

IDIOTS and lunatics cannot commit suicide, 270
Impediments to marriage, 255
Incense forbidden, 105
Induction of a Minister, 284
Injunctions of 1559, 35
authority of, 42, 47
Institution of Ministers, office of, 283
Introits, 206
Invitation, the, in Communion service, 219
Invocation in, 222
Irregularities in the performance of the services, 73, 203

JAMES I., his position, 53
Jubilate Deo, 178

KNEELING at the Communion, 224
does not imply adoration of the elements, 228

LATHBURY'S account of Cranmer's catechism, 6
Laud, Archbishop, did not change the Prayer Book, 63
Laurence, Archbishop, 38
Law and liberty in the American Church, 123, 129
Lessons, the, 175
Liberty, present, in the use of the American Book, 124
Litany, history of, 191
changes from the English, 194
Scotch, 63
invocations of, 192, 193
deprecations, 192, 193
obsecrations, 192, 193
intercessions, 192, 193
the lesser, 192
Liturgical liberty now allowed, 133
revision and relaxation, 129, 131
Liturgy, changes proposed in A. D. 1641, 65
attempts to revise under William and Mary, 75
the question of, in the General Convention of 1785, 86
Lushington, Dr., decision in case of Westerton and Liddell, 100

MARTYR, Peter, and Bucer, their suggestions, 6, 21
Maryland, Church of, her declaration of independence, 127
Maskell, criticism of First Communion office, 4
Mass abolished in 1547, 4
Latin, set aside, 194
Matrimony, seasons when to be solemnized, 248
bans of, 252
place and hour for the celebration of, 252
position of the parties in, 253
licenses for, in the English Church, 253
impediments to, 253, 254
giving of the woman in, 256
force of the compact of, 257
promises in the York Manual, 259
giving of the ring, 257, 258
fee for Minister, 258, 259
declarations on giving the ring, 258
English rubrics concerning, 261
Melancthon, 19
Memorial papers, 131
Minister, his positions in Communion service, 154, 201
Morning prayer, sources of, 148
where to be said, 152

NON-CONFORMISTS, address to the King, 68
Non-communicants not to remain at Communion, 218
Non-jurors, Liturgy of, 76
Notes to explain First Book of Edward VI., 12
Notices in Church, 209, 211
of Communion, 210
of bans of matrimony, 212

OBLATION, the, 222
Occasional prayers and thanksgivings, where to be said, 186, 187
Offertory, the, where to be read, 214
history of, 214
by whom to be collected, 215
and in what manner, 215
Omission of English regulations equivalent to prohibition, 96–100
Orders, the three, 281
Organs, lawful, though not prescribed, 101
Ornaments of Communion Table in time of Charles I., 198

PAINTINGS in Churches, 200
People, their attitudes in the Communion service, 201
Peter Martyr, 19
Petition, the millenary, 54, 55
for revision in 1772, 78
Pews in the XVIIIth century, 155
Pia deliberatio of Herman, 9
Pilkington, Bishop, to Gaulter, concerning vestments, 38
Postures in divine service, 203
Prayer, the, for all conditions of men, 186, 187
for the President of the United States, 185
for rain and fair weather, 188
in time of dearth and famine, 188
in war and tumult, 188
in time of great sickness and mortality, 189
for a sick person, 189
for a person going to sea, 189
for a person in affliction, 189
Evening, 190
for meetings of Conventions, 189
the Lord's, 173
the Lord's, in Communion office, 204
before sermon, 210
the bidding, 210
for Christ's Church militant, 217
before consecration in the Communion office, 220
the, of consecration, 221
days, 235
Prayers proposed by Dr. Muhlenberg, 190
for the dead, 275
at sea, 278
for visitation of prisoners, 279
Prayer Book, the Second of Edward VI., 22

Prayer Book—
how the Second differs from the First, 122
committee on revision of, 33
the Second, of Edward, adopted under Elizabeth, 1559, 33
variations of the Second, of Edward, from the First, 36
the Latin, 40
the, in the reign of James I., 53
revision of, in 1662, 68
changes in, 72
the Arian and Socinian, 77
the Proposed, 87
reception of the Proposed, in 1786, 89
modifications of, in 1786, 89
the present, adopted in 1789, 90
changes in the American, 91–96
prescribes and limits our practice, 123, 124
the American, not identical with the English, 125
certification of its correctness, 138
its ratification in 1789, 140
the preface to, 141

REFORMERS, during Queen Mary's reign, 27
views of, on Elizabeth's accession, 28
Revision of the Prayer Book, recent efforts for, 80
association for, 82
Ridley, Bishop, comments on Hooper, 16
directs removal of altars, 16
Ritual, Royal Commission on, 82
method of modifying, 84
law and liberty of, in England, 96
Rogation Days, 146
Romanists during the first ten years of Elizabeth's reign, 29, 30
Rubric, first, of Communion office, 195, 196
second and third, 197
Rubric—
the third in visitation of the sick, 266
before the consecration prayer, 221
after the distribution of the Sacrament, 225
Rubrics after the Communion office, 227
the last in the Communion office, 228

SACRAMENT, form of words in the delivery of, 229
Salutation, the mutual, 185
Sandys, Bishop, concerning the habits, 38
Say and sing, what parts of the service to, 167, 271
Sentences, the introductory, 160
Sermon, when to follow, 212
Service, the whole, in English, A. D. 1549, 7
for 4th of July, 87
sources of, 8, 9
old Books of, prohibited and destroyed, 10, 11
a prescribed, excludes all others, 97, 98
Services and prayers, occasional, 41
Sponsors, their antiquity, 232
Strype, account of Queen Elizabeth's position, 31
Sunday letter, the, 146
Superstitions before practised, prohibited, 12
Surplice, the, 159
Sursum Corda and Ter Sanctus, 220

TABLE, the Communion, position of, 199
decoration of, 200
Tables of Lessons, 142
Tables and Rules for Feasts, 144, 146
Te Deum, 177
Thanksgiving of women after childbirth, 189, 277
Thanksgiving service, 186
Tunicles forbidden by the Second Book of Edward VI., 46

UNIFORMITY, Acts of, prohibit additions to the services, 97
Uses, pre-reformation, not now lawful, 99
what the pre-reformation would introduce, 99

VARIATIONS of Elizabeth's Book from that of Edward VI., 36
Venite, rubric before the, 174
Versicles, 173, 185
Vestments, the, forbidden by the advertisements of 1665, 115
forbidden by Second Book of Edward, 46
in the American Church, 156, 157
prohibited by Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, Bishops opposed to, 39
Visitation, Royal, of 1547, 2
of the sick, office of, 261
sources of, 261
order of, 262

WATER not to be added to wine, 217
Wafer bread forbidden, 105
William, Prince of Orange, declaration of, 75
Wordsworth, Bishop, his interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric, 118

YEAR, the Ecclesiastical, 206